The Mennonite Quarterly Review

Volume XXVIII July 1954 Number Three

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 162

ITALIAN HUTTERITE MARTYRS 163
Henry A. DeWind

THE ANABAPTIST DOCTRINE OF THE RESTITUTION OF THE CHURCH 186
Frank J. Wray

A STUDY OF MENNONITE SOCIAL DISTANCE REACTIONS 197
Lee R. Just

PETER RIDEMAN AND MENNO SIMONS ON ECONOMICS 205
Donald Sommer

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES 224
An Iowa Mennonite Church Constitution of 1865
Melvin Gingerich

BOOK REVIEWS 228
Elizabeth Hershberger Bauman, *Coals of Fire.*
Reviewed by Barbara C. Smucker
Joseph Winfield Fretz, *Pilgrims in Paraguay. The Story of Mennonite Colonization in South America.*
Reviewed by Willard H. Smith
Herbert Butterfield, *Christianity, Diplomacy and War.*
Reviewed by John Howard Yoder

EDITORIAL

SINCE THE TIME OF KARL BENRATH'S STUDIES ON THE VENETIAN ANABAPTISTS (1885-1887) it has been taken for granted that there were Anabaptists in Italy. Henry DeWind's doctoral dissertation of 1951 under Professor Pauck has convincingly shown that Benrath, and later Comba (1897) confused anti-Trinitarians and Anabaptists and that there were no real Anabaptist congregations in Italy. There were, however, Italians who became Hutterites, joining the group in Moravia. Some of these in turn became missioners in their homeland, and three of them became martyrs. DeWind's excellent study of these martyrs, Gherlandi, della Sega, and Rizzetto, using Italian archival sources, is the first publication in English aside from the brief references in his article in *Church History* (1952) on "Anabaptism and Italy." The noble character and martyr testimony of della Sega matches that of any Anabaptist martyr elsewhere.

THE ANABAPTIST DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH CONTINUES TO ENGAGE THE CAREFUL STUDY OF students of the Reformation and Anabaptist history, as it must for anyone who seriously deals with the Anabaptists. No proper understanding of the movement or any of its doctrines is possible apart from it. So it was also in Frank Wray's study of the Anabaptist understanding of history in his Yale doctoral dissertation under Professor Bainton. He, like Littell, sees in the concept of "Restitution" a major controlling idea in the Anabaptist church concept, though he develops it somewhat differently.

USING NEW TECHNIQUES OF SOCIO-PSYCHOLOGICAL ANALYSIS, LEE R. JUST OF TABOR COLLEGE has made an extensive study of the attitudes of the high school and college student young people of the three major Mennonite groups in the United States as revealed in their "social distance" reactions and ratings. The *Review* is happy to present his findings in this issue, not only for the revealing content of the findings but also and more particularly for the demonstration of the use of scientific techniques in securing a more penetrating and reliable interpretation of the attitude and behaviour patterns of contemporary Mennonites. We should like to have the casual explanation for the significant variations in social distance attitudes reported in the findings, but this is another study.

DID THE EARLY ANABAPTISTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY DIFFERENT ATTITUDES ON ECONOMIC matters from the other Reformation groups? The answer to this question is sought by Donald Sommer in a detailed study of the writings of two major Anabaptist leaders, the Hutterite Peter Rideman and the Dutch Menno Simons. The Hutterites of course established a unique Christian communist order which operated successfully for a century until it was practically extinguished by force, in this differing drastically from the Swiss and Dutch Brethren, who though believing in true brotherhood and the Christian community did not hold that Christian love requires communistic production or even consumption practices. Yet both the Hutterites and the others differed from the Reformation churches in their strong insistence upon the practice of brotherly love in economics and the endeavor to maintain equality. The insistence of both on an agricultural economy as over against a commercial one would seem, however, to be grounded on a different basis than the teachings of Christ and the apostles.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXVIII JULY 1954 NUMBER THREE

ITALIAN HUTTERITE MARTYRS

HENRY A. DEWIND*

The Archives of the Inquisition at Venice contain a number of documents of keen interest to students of Anabaptist history. The analysis of these documents—reports of hearings of persons accused of doctrinal heresy, confessions of faith by the accused, letters written by the accused but never delivered to their addresses —led Karl Benrath[1] and Emilio Comba[2] to false conclusions about the extent and character of an Anabaptist movement in north Italy during the mid-sixteenth century.[3] Benrath and Comba erred in failing to distinguish satisfactorily between those Italian radicals who were anti-Trinitarians and those (very few in number) who sought for and found their idea of a true church in the Hutterite communities in Moravia. In this place I should like to bring together the stories of several of these true Täufer, drawing upon

* Henry DeWind wrote his doctor's dissertation at the University of Chicago in 1951 on "Relations Between Italian Reformers and Anabaptists in the Mid-sixteenth Century." He is now on the faculty of Wisconsin State College at Whitewater.

1 K. Benrath, "Wiedertäufer im Venetianischen um die Mitte des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* LVIII (1885) 9-67. Much of this material is also included in his *Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig,* No. 18 of *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* (Halle, 1887).

2 E. Comba, *I nostri protestanti.* Vol. II, *Durante la riforma nel Veneto e nell'Istria* (Firenze, 1897). See especially chapters entitled "Giulio Gherlandi" (555-87), "Francesco della Sega" (519-54), "Antonio Rizzetto" (589-602).

3 I have elsewhere tried to show the qualifications needed in order to reach a proper understanding of the nature of this movement. See my article, "'Anabaptism' and Italy," *Church History,* XXI (1952) 20-38.

the documents now available only in the Venetian Archives or in relatively inaccessible German and Italian publications. My account of necessity will deal only with those individuals whose story is known to us because records pertaining to them have been preserved by the organ that brought them to their martyrdom. These men were Giulio Gherlandi, Francesco della Sega, and Antonio Rizzetto.

Giulio Gherlandi *(ca. 1520-62)*

Giulio Gherlandi was born at Spresiano near Treviso around 1520, the son of a one-time priest Vincenzo de' Gherlandi, who was a native of Padua.[4] His father, desiring that Giulio should become a priest, had his son practice saying the offices of the church and take the first orders.[5] This apparently healthy orientation did not prevent the boy from falling into what he later spoke of as an evil life, but the contrast between his sinful behavior and his pretensions to a church career led to a troubled conscience. Says he in his confession, "It appeared to me that the Christian life ought not to be only in words but should consist also in a desire to walk in fact the Christian path."[6] One day while reading his breviary he came upon the words of Christ in Matthew 7:15, 16: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits." As he reflected on this passage, Gherlandi knew that he must change his way of life. He therefore "departed from Rome, 'scalded' by its life and teaching."[7]

Gherlandi left the Catholic Church around 1549-51.[8] He seems first to have cast his lot with the group of evangelicals in Venetia who are described by Benrath and Comba as Anabaptists but who actually at that time were mostly veering in the direction of anti-Trinitarianism.[9] He was baptized[10] by Nicolo di Alessan-

[4] Interrogation of March 29, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti,* 572. In October, 1561, he appeared to the Inquisitors to be around forty years of age, and he confirmed this. Interrogation of October 14, 1561, *ibid.,* 580.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] This confession was prepared by him during his second imprisonment at Venice. Benrath dates it October 21, 1561, "Wiedertäufer," 64, while Comba places it on October 23rd, *Protestanti,* 559, n. 1. The confession is printed in full by V. Bellondi, *Documenti e aneddoti di storia veneziana (810-1854) tratti dall'Archivio de' Frari* (Firenze, 1902), 95-99. The quotation cited is in Comba, 558; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 59; Bellondi, 95.

[7] Comba, *op. cit.,* 558; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 59; Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 96.

[8] When asked by whom he had been baptized Gherlandi said, "Nicolo di Alessandria of Treviso, at Lancenigo, it could be ten or twelve years ago," interrogation of October 14, 1561, Comba, *op. cit.,* 580-81.

[9] DeWind, *op. cit.,* especially 28-33.

[10] He later denied having been rebaptized, Comba, *op. cit.,* 580.

dria, a member of the community of Treviso, who was identified with the anti-Trinitarian faction of the north Italian movement.[11] Gherlandi had later (*ca.* 1551-53) baptized several persons:

> Whom have you baptized?
>
> Gian Filippo a Sicilian. I believe that he was a student. I baptized him eight or ten years ago in the house of Mr. Bastian Bellanza. And I baptized one Leonardo of Verona, a weaver of that city, and some others of whom I did not keep account because they are not with us, wishing to live according to their own opinions.[12]

The latter persons probably were anti-Trinitarians with whom Gherlandi preferred now to recognize little or no connection.[13] In his confession Gherlandi ignored this whole period of relationship with the questionable anti-Trinitarian movement, claiming simply that he had looked about him for a people who lived according to Scripture until he had discovered the Moravian Hutterites.[14]

Gherlandi must certainly have felt the effects of the general destruction of the Venetian evangelical movement that followed the revelations made to the Inquisition in October and November, 1551, by Pietro Manelfi.[15] During that time Gherlandi cast about for some Christian group whose views were compatible with his own and sometime during the 1550's[16] he, together with Francesco della Sega, discovered the Hutterites:

> I, together with Francesco della Sega of Rovigo, went into those parts, and not having found what we looked for, I came home and he stayed in Vienna, and later he came to call me, and together we went to live in those parts and we found what we sought.[17]

It is evident that Gherlandi was thoroughly impressed by the life and teachings of the Hutterites, whom he called the "people of God."[18] In his 1561 confession he praises them highly and summarizes their teachings.[19] There appears to have been no

11 Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 38, 39.

12 Interrogation of October 14, 1561, Comba, *op. cit.*, 581.

13 This is Comba's conjecture, *op. cit.*, 581, n. 1.

14 *Ibid.*, 559; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 59-60; Bellondi, *op. cit.*, 96.

15 Manelfi's depositions are printed by E. Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista a Venezia anno 1550," *Rivista cristiana*, XIII (1885) 21-24, 83-87. For the pertinent facts see DeWind, *op. cit.*, 29.

16 In 1559 Gherlandi said he had been living in Moravia "for some years," Comba, *Protestanti*, 572; see Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 39.

17 Interrogation of March 29, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 573; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 39.

18 Interrogation of March 29, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 573: "Why is that the people of God and not this?" "Because in no other place than there have I seen people who walk according to God and the rules of Jesus Christ."

19 Comba, *Protestanti*, 559-60; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 60, 61; Bellondi, *op. cit.*, 96, 97.

particular problem involved in admitting Gherlandi to the community. He says of this merely, "When we had been joined to the church."[20] He states specifically that he and the other Italians who went to Moravia with him, "being already baptized in Italy, did not need a new baptism, because the understanding is that there is one God and one faith alone; thus the church holds but one baptism."[21]

Gherlandi settled down in Moravia in one of the communal settlements and practiced his trade of making lanterns.[22] He identifies his place of residence as the "villa of Pansterem (?), which I believe to be under Hihilspruch (?)."[23] It was not long, however, before Gherlandi felt the urge to bring news of the Hutterites to those of his fellow believers back in Italy who were troubled by the anti-Trinitarian orientation of the movement there. Let him tell the story in his own words:

> I will come now to the narration of the things that happened after I went to Moravia: and first, when we had been joined to the church, I began to observe its life, its orders, and proceedings; and not seeing anything at which offense could be taken, I was, on the contrary, quickly edified by their good example. . . . After I had been there around ten or fifteen days I acquired the confidence to compare my faith with theirs, and comparing it, I was pleased. However, not finding it conformable to that which others had been recently preaching in Italy, namely, concerning the incarnation of Christ, I requested permission from the church to come into Italy to warn my friends so that such a pestiferous teaching should not occasion greater destruction. The church, granting this to me, gave me a letter, a copy of which is in your hands. And those in Italy who would wish to submit themselves to the rule of the church were to come to Moravia, for there was no minister in Italy.[24]

Early in March, 1559, Gherlandi left Moravia on his visit to the "brethren" in Italy, accompanied by two other Italians who had found refuge with the Hutterites.[25] He carried with him a

[20] Comba, *Protestanti,* 560; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 61; Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 97.

[21] Comba, *Protestanti,* 561; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 62; Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 98.

[22] Interrogation of October 14, 1561, Comba, *Protestanti,* 580.

[23] Interrogation of November 16, 1561, Comba, *Protestanti,* 584. The question marks are Comba's. I find no names resembling "Pansterem" or "Hihilspruch" among the *Haushaben* cited by J. Loserth in "Haushaben," *Menn. Lex.* II, 267. Both Benrath and Comba declare that Gherlandi was a member of the Nikolsburg community but without citing evidence. If we may read "Pausrom" for "Pansterem" and "Nikolsburg" for "Hihilspruch," we could assign Gherlandi to a community near Nikolsburg. It was to Pausrom, interestingly enough, that some time after 1540 a delegation of believers from Thessalonica came to make contact with a group which they took to consist of fellow believers of theirs. For this incident see Th. van Braght, *The Martyrs' Mirror,* 1660 (English edition Scottdale, Pa., 1951) 365-69.

[24] Comba, *Protestanti,* 560; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 61, 62; Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 97.

[25] Later Gherlandi refused to divulge the names of his companions to the Inquisition despite threats and the possible use of torture, cf. interrogation of March 29, 1559,

letter from Francesco della Sega to a fellow believer in Vicenza,[26] and a general letter of introduction from the Moravian congregation to the Italian evangelicals. This letter, referred to in the passage cited above and "sent by the brothers Giulio, Mattheo, and Bernardo from the church of Moravia gathered together in Christ,"[27] explains that several Italians had joined the community in Moravia and now desired to share with their fellow believers in Italy the peace which they had found. However, the letter stipulates that only those individuals would be welcome in Moravia whose minds were not contaminated with false doctrines about the nature of Christ, the resurrection from the dead, angels, devils, or other matters,[28] and it includes a confession of the faith held by the Moravian church. Besides this letter Gherlandi also brought with him a list of over one hundred Italians thought to be most inclined toward accepting the teachings of the Hutterites and whom he intended to contact. This list of believers, all of humble status,[29] amplified by the Inquisitor's addition of persons and places mentioned in the hearings, now rests in the State Archives at Venice. Study of this list reveals that a considerable number of persons still adhered to the "Anabaptist" tenets in Venetia; and over sixty localities, including some in the Grisons, are also named.[30]

The documents we possess fail to give a clear picture of Gherlandi's itinerary. We hear of him on March 21, 1559, in connection with an incident at Malamocco in the course of a voyage by sea from Chioggia (south of Venice) to Venice. The boat was stopped by port authorities checking for disease. In what must have been routine fashion the authorities sought to expedite matters by requiring a formal oath from all aboard that there was no disease.

> And I (Gherlandi relates) said to him that I would tell the truth without swearing, and he, insisting that I should swear, ordered the boat made fast to a post and wrote a letter to the Board of Health in Venice, ordering the boatman under penalty of law that he should permit no one to debark from the boat until the letter had been presented to the Board

Comba, *Protestanti,* 575. From the general letter mentioned below, however, their names would seem to have been Mattheo and Bernardo.

26 This letter was dated March 5, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti,* 567, n. 1. The letter was probably in the hands of the Inquisition but Comba makes no mention of its contents.

27 Giulio's companions are not further identified. The letter is printed by Comba, *Protestanti,* 563-66, and by Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 100-102, and is condensed by Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 39f.

28 These are obvious references to the teachings approved by the Venetian council of 1550; see DeWind, *op. cit.,* 30.

29 Comba, *Protestanti,* 568.

30 The list is printed by Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 41, and Comba, *Protestanti,* 567-68,

and authority granted by them. And again he insisted that I swear; and I would not swear, whence I was threatened with being held as a bandit.[31]

Gherlandi was released, for we find him a few days later in a hostel near Treviso, openly and at length criticizing the teachings of the Roman Church in "Lutheran" fashion, especially attacking the doctrines concerning Christ's grant of authority to Peter, the Eucharist, and confession to priests.[32] Word of Gherlandi's activity reached the authorities and he was arrested on March 29 and brought to the mayor's palace, where he was questioned by Count Giulio Gabriel, the mayor, and a member of the clergy, Pietro Ugolino. During the hearing Gherlandi divulged many details of his life and beliefs, of his activities in Moravia, and of the nature of the Moravian church.[33] He was then put in irons to await further examination.

Two weeks later, on April 12, Gherlandi was led, bound like a criminal, to Venice to the house of the same Count Giulio who had already questioned him near Treviso. During that night Gherlandi escaped from the room in which he was being kept with the assistance of a servant of whom two years later he said, "I had the occasion of escaping by aid of a young man there in the house whom I saw but would not recognize."[34]

After his flight Gherlandi returned to Moravia, but at Christmas of 1560,[35] despite the fact that he had been banned from Venetian territory, he returned to Italy with a companion. He was captured a second time in the fall of 1561 in Treviso, but now he was imprisoned in Venice in more secure quarters. From his prison he reported his predicament in a letter dated October 14, 1561, addressed to Leonhard (presumably Lanzenstiel), head of the Moravian community; this document, however, never got farther than the Inquisitorial files.[36] The letter runs as follows:

Giulio, servant of Jesus Christ, to the beloved brethren of the church of Moravia, chosen according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through the sanctification of the Spirit in the obedience and shedding of blood of Jesus Christ, grace and peace be multiplied in you.

[31] Interrogation of March 21, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 569.

[32] Interrogations of certain local residents on March 29, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 570-71.

[33] Interrogation of Gherlandi on March 29, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 572-75.

[34] Interrogations of servants, April 13, 1559, Comba, *Protestanti*, 576-77, and interrogation of Gherlandi, October 14, 1561, *ibid.*, 580.

[35] Interrogation of October 23, 1561, *ibid.*, 583.

[36] The letter is printed by Comba, *Protestanti*, 577-79, and by Bellondi, *op. cit.*, 102-3, but with date October 4, 1561. Benrath also dates it October 4 but does not print the letter, "Wiedertäufer," 41.

After I left you I had no opportunity or means of giving you news about me, nor can I now personally come since I am being held in stocks in the house of Count Giovanni of the place called San Polo, in Venice, above the foundation of the place called San Giovanni in Bragora, in the Casa Gabriele. Since the above-mentioned lord count promised me that this letter would be delivered, I did not wish to refrain from writing you. Although I believe that my dear brethren have good faith toward me, yet I did not wish to miss, for the sake of greater security, writing you with my own hand, and advising you that I am of good courage, and how firmly I hope in the Lord God (our benign and favorable Father, admirable in all His holiness) that this my imprisonment will be all to the praise and glory of His divine majesty and a manifestation of His holy truth. In accordance with that small gift that He has conferred and will confer on me according to His good pleasure, I will accept the instruction of Peter, in his first Epistle, third chapter, where he exhorts us that we ought not to fear nor be moved by terror of those (enemies of our faith), but to sanctify the Lord God in our hearts and to be always prepared to respond to what He asks of that hope that is in us. Do not for a moment doubt that there will be given me in that hour, according to the true divine promise, wisdom, against which all the adversaries shall not be able to resist. Assist me yet, my dearest brethren, always in your prayers to God for me, as I do pray for you that you shall not and do not lack that faith that is also in my heart of believing in justice, and thus with my mouth do I make confession.

Take then joyously the gentle yoke of the Lord and the weight upon me will be light.

In Venice, October 14, 1561

After writing this I learned that the messenger had already departed and that the lord count had gone to his villa; but there remains here in the house the priest who is the father of that bandit who seized me and who solicits of the authorities that, as a reward for informing on me, his son should be freed from his bonds, and thus he continually appeals for my death; but it will be a hard thing to resist God.

If it will be convenient for you, write to me; I will be grateful for your letters.

Now the Inquisition made every effort to bring Gherlandi to recant and to return to Catholicism and, failing this, to name his accomplices.[37] Hearings, interviews, admonitions, and torture followed for the prisoner, but he remained steadfast.[38]

On October 23, in the presence of his superiors, Gherlandi wrote and signed the confession to which we have already made reference. This confession contains a brief account of how Gherlandi came to the decision to quit the Catholic Church, of how he sought for a church that would be in accordance with his religious views, and of how he was so impressed by the Hutterites that he joined their church. The confession also describes the beliefs of the Moravians and a number of their practices, including their pro-

[37] Interrogation of October 14, 1561. Comba, *Protestanti*, 579-81.

[38] Cf. interrogations of October 14 and 23, 1561, *ibid.*, 583-84 and of November 16, 1561, *ibid.*, 584-85.

cedure in admitting new members to the community (this involved baptism with pure water in the name of the Trinity), their custom of having frequent sermons to exhort members to live a pure life, and their measures for disciplining the brethren and maintaining the purity of the community.

In a hearing held on November 16 Gherlandi requested that, since the Inquisitors had called him a heretic, the judges would tell him in what respects he had erred, basing their statements, however, on the Scriptures. The judges agreed and sent to him in his prison three theologians, one a Servite and the others Dominicans. There followed some lively discussions which ended when the theologians found Gherlandi "most obstinate in the crime of heresy, most ignorant also in the words of the Gospel." The Servite father indeed begged Gherlandi to cease bothering him with his speeches and sanctimonious words. When the two Dominicans sought to persuade Gherlandi with natural reason, decrees of councils, and arguments drawn from ancient tradition, he taunted them by saying that the Roman Church had placed itself in opposition to Holy Scriptures.[39]

Gherlandi was now permitted to linger in his prison for the better part of a year. During this time he refused to let the constraint of his prison or the memory of torture break down his sure faith in the rightness of his beliefs. Instead he devoted his time in the prison to the attempt to win over others to his faith. The Inquisitorial court became aware of these efforts of his and determined to admonish him through the offices of a priest who, however, found his attempts to induce the heretic to repentance rebuffed completely. When the priest urged Gherlandi to go before the court on his knees to beg pardon, he was answered, "To God alone ought I to bend the knee and not to worldly men."[40] It is perhaps not coincidental that the court determined to take some action pertaining to Gherlandi during the month of September. It was on the first day of that month[41] that Gherlandi's old friend and companion on his first trip in search of their desired community, Francesco della Sega, was brought to Venice after being betrayed to the Inquisition and was placed in the same prison with Gherlandi, San Giovanni in Bragora. As della Sega entered the prison Gherlandi, having recognized his voice, called to him first in German, and then in Italian. Thus the two friends were now able to

[39] Interviews of November 27 and 29, 1561, *ibid.*, 585.
[40] Report to the Court, September 19, 1562, *ibid.*, 586.
[41] Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 44.

reap comfort from this perhaps unseen contact with each other, and Gherlandi was able to pass on to della Sega advice and consolation in this period of distress.[42]

The time had now arrived for the court to issue a final decision in Gherlandi's case. Dated October 15, 1562, and made known to the prisoner on October 23, the official statement summarized the case and pointed out that the examinations, the evidence of others and the prisoner's own confession clearly displayed Gherlandi's heresies; it said that the court had without avail made attempts to lead him back to the right path; it ordered that he be degraded from the office of subdeacon to which he had been ordained; and it turned him over to the servants of the tribunal for execution of the sentence. The sentence concludes, "Let the incorrigible and impenitent heretic be consigned to the ministry of this sacred tribunal and let him be led by them and cast into the deep sea, in a manner such that, when submerged, he shall die."[43]

Gherlandi yet found the means to send a final greeting to the community, written on a scrap of paper and delivered to della Sega by the prison attendant. Della Sega later reported the incident in a letter to Moravia, paying tribute to Gherlandi's splendid example of faith in his martyrdom.[44]

The sentence was carried out, probably soon after it had been handed down, in the manner customary at Venice. Gherlandi was bound, and having been brought in one of two boats out to where the lagoon near the sea was deepest, he was stretched on a plank which extended between the two boats. Then at a signal from the officer in charge the boats slowly moved away from each other and Gherlandi sank silently into the depths.[45]

Francesco della Sega *(ca. 1528 or 1532-65)*

Francesco della Sega was born at Rovigo in 1528 or 1532,[46] the son of Bartolomeo of Rovigo, and lived in the suburb of San

[42] *Ibid.*, 44, 46; Comba, *Protestanti,* 540. The source for this information would appear to be a letter written to the Moravian community by Francesco della Sega early in 1563.

[43] "Projiciatur in profundum maris ita et taliter quod ibi submergatur et ejus vitam terminet." The sentence was confirmed by the three experts in heresy cases, Paolo Cornelio, Girolamo Grimani, and Aloisio Mocenigo, and was witnessed by the nuncio of the Court, Aloisio Scortica, Comba, *Protestanti,* 586, n. 2; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 46, 47, summarizes the judgment; Bellondi, *op. cit.,* 105, mistakenly dates it October 13th.

[44] Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 47.

[45] *Ibid.*, 47; Comba, *Protestanti,* 587; J. Beck, *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* etc., *Fontes Rerum Austriacarum* XLIII (1883) 239-40.

[46] Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 45, and Comba, *Protestanti,* 525, say he was born in

Bartolomeo.[47] He was sent by his father to Padua to study civil law and to acquire those elements of sophistication which would prove profitable in later life. At Padua he fell into a life of pleasure-seeking ("balls, feasts, games, childishness, frenzies, and drunkenness"), despite the excesses of which he was reputed to be a good Christian in that he conformed to the usual pattern of the youth of that time and place. In fact, "Had someone said to me that I was not a good Christian, I should have taken violent issue with him."[48] Della Sega's excesses brought about sickness, and while he was confined to his bed he had occasion to require the services of a cobbler. This simple man gently chided him for his way of life, assuring him that it was not Christian to behave as he had done and urging him to read the life and teachings of Christ to prove this for himself. Thus impelled, della Sega began to read the Scriptures and therein found material enough to trouble his conscience. He therefore resolved to turn from his sinful ways and to pattern his life after that of Christ. His new way of life brought upon him the scorn of his father and his friends, much as had happened with St. Francis of Assisi, and when he forsook the law as a career, his father turned him from the house. Thereupon he took up the trade of tailor.[49]

The next we hear about della Sega is in reference to his contacts with the Hutterites in Moravia, perhaps about 1557.[50] It would appear that a considerable gap in his biography exists, since he would have been in his early twenties when he gave up the law, and that would have been somewhere around 1550-52. It may well be that in his confession della Sega avoided mention of those years because of contacts during that time with the Venetian anti-Trinitarian movement with which he had some acquaintance. In his confession he says,

> At this time I was not aware of Moravia and I went to Vienna. There I provided myself with a master, my friend, a Hungarian canon. I was with him for a time in Vienna and for a time in Hungary until the occasion when I met a servant from Moravia who told me of a people who lived

1532, but Comba, 540, says he was thirty-four years old in 1562; on della Sega also see Beck, *op. cit.*, 241-43.

[47] Interrogation of September 26, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti*, 540.

[48] This material and that which follows concerning della Sega's early life and conversion is drawn from a confession prepared by him for the Inquisitorial Court in Venice on October 20, 1562, and authenticated November 5, 1562. Comba prints excerpts, *Protestanti*, 525-28, 542-45, 545, n. 1.

[49] Interrogation of September 26, 1562, *ibid.*, 540.

[50] In September, 1562, he said he had lived in Moravia for two or three years, *ibid.*, 541; Gherlandi in March, 1559, claimed that he had been living in Moravia "for some years," *ibid.*, 572, and had learned of Moravia from della Sega, *ibid.*, 573; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," says only that della Sega went to Moravia in the late 1550's, 45.

partly in Moravia and partly in Hungary, [i.e., Slovakia], praising them highly.[51]

Della Sega accompanied this servant, whose knowledge of the language and roads he required, on trips to the communities about which he had been told. Having informed himself about the life of the Hutterites by observations made on these visits, he became convinced that they were a truly godly people, dedicated to leading pure lives and to expressing brotherly love toward one another. He was also impressed by their devotion to the preservation of purity in their midst, which led them to provide for the excommunication of those of their number who threatened by their lives to defile the rest. Della Sega was further pleased at the simplicity of the Hutterite life, comparing this feature favorably with the "subtleties, curiosities, and mysteries" which might be found in other groups.[52]

> And having experienced in fact for some weeks that this [their lives and teachings] was so, I asked to be received into their union, because I too desired to leave the world and sin and to follow the holiness without which no one shall see God; and thus they received me.

Unfortunately we do not know when, where, or by whom della Sega was baptized. He was vague and evasive on this subject when questioned by the Inquisition on September 26, 1562.[53] It would not be surprising should it turn out that his experience paralleled that of Gherlandi in this respect; i.e., that he was baptized by the anti-Trinitarians in north Italy and then had this baptism confirmed in Moravia. His reluctance to bring up this erring period in his life would be quite understandable. Della Sega's story does not clearly state what community he joined.[54] It appears that he first allied himself with one of the groups in Slovakia and then later moved to Moravia. Moravia was his ultimate place of residence, perhaps because of the presence of other Italians there, although it may be that these other Italians only arrived after Francesco had passed the word along to them.[55]

[51] Della Sega's confession, Comba, *Protestanti,* 527.

[52] *Ibid.,* 528.

[53] *Ibid.,* 541.

[54] "I stay in a house, in a villa with around 150 others, mostly Germans," *ibid.,* 541.

[55] Pierpaolo Vergerio, adviser to and representative of Duke Christoph, the Lutheran prince of Württemberg, after returning from a trip to Austria, reported the situation in Moravia to his master in 1558. Moravia was teeming with Anabaptists, says Vergerio, adding that there were thirty Italians among them. He fails to name specific persons or locations, E. von Kaussler and T. Schott (eds.), *Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph, Herzog von Württemberg und Petrus Paulus Vergerius,* in *Bibliothek des Literarischen Vereins in Stuttgart,* CXXIV (1875) No. 61a, 167.

Della Sega evidently found the life in his new home highly satisfying. He soon married a woman from the Grisons, Orsola of the Engadine, and they had a son.[56] Thus did he lead a quiet, happy life with his fellow believers, contenting himself with his simple occupation.

Della Sega's life took a different turn when he received word of his father's death, probably in 1559[57] The hope of receiving his share of the inheritance (which, according to Hutterite custom, would be turned over to the community) led him to visit Italy. But this was far from simply a business trip, for della Sega took advantage of his presence in Italy on this and apparently other occasions to spread the word about Moravia to various north Italian evangelicals who were still practicing their religion clandestinely. The papers of della Sega's case indicate that he visited the "Polesina" many times to visit the "brethren" and that he led some of them with their wives and children to Moravia.[58]

This missionary activity raises the question whether della Sega had been commissioned as a minister of the Gospel by the Moravians. The *Geschichts-Bücher* openly declare that by 1561 della Sega was regarded as a minister of the Word: "Disser Franciscus, welcher bei unserer gemain auch in Dienst des Wortes Gottes gestelt worden und in Teutscher und welischer sprach gepredigt hat" and "In disen 61. Jar ist der Brueder Francisco von der Sag aus dem Wälschlandt in Dienst des Evangeliums erwelt und fürgestelt worden."[59] The ability to speak both Italian and German must have rendered him invaluable to the Moravian group. In his confession, however, della Sega, in speaking about baptism, said: "I have not baptized anyone because I am neither priest nor minister. I am a simple tailor."[60] It may be that della Sega had been given special permission to function as a missionary, that is, to spread the Word, but had not formally obtained appointment as a minister in the Hutterite community.

On one of these missionary ventures, in the year 1562, della Sega was accompanied by Antonio Rizzetto of Vicenza and Nicola Buccella of Padua. The purpose of the trip, according to della Sega, was to deliver letters and to see relatives.[61] The missionary

[56] He would have married after he settled in Moravia. Interrogation of September 26, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti,* 541; cf. letter to Moravia of early 1563, *ibid.,* 546, n. 3; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 50.

[57] Comba, *Protestanti,* 537, but without citing source.

[58] *Ibid.,* 537; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 45, cites some cases.

[59] Beck, *op. cit.,* 212.

[60] Comba, *Protestanti,* 542. [61] Interrogation of September 26, 1562, *ibid.,* 541.

efforts of these men (an unmentioned part of their purpose) met with success and in August, accompanied by some twenty fellow believers from Cittadella and its environs,[62] they were preparing to embark on the journey to Moravia when by treachery they fell into the hands of the authorities. The traitor in this sordid affair was an erstwhile companion, a Swiss named Alessio Todeschi from Bellinzona, who sought the aid of Captain Lando, mayor of Capodistria, in recovering fifty gold scudi which he claimed was owing to him by Gian Battista Buccella, brother of Nicola.[63] Lando soon realized that he had more on his hands than a case of misappropriated funds and by insistent questioning learned from Todeschi that heresy was involved. Lando then acted quickly and had della Sega, Rizzetto, and Nicola Buccella placed under arrest just as they were about to sail for Trieste on August 27, 1562. The other passengers were permitted to proceed on their way. Needless to say they quickly dispersed upon their disembarkation at Trieste, much to Lando's disgust when he realized what their purpose had been. The fate of the twenty is not known, save that they passed across the borders in a northerly direction.[64] The affair seemed serious, so the informer himself was arrested and questioned about the purposes and plans of della Sega and his companions.[65] When he learned that a question of heresy was involved, Captain Lando wrote the authorities at Venice to inform them that della Sega and his fellows were "heretics who were conducting some other persons for the purpose of embarking with them for Moravia." He further castigated the prisoners as persons who

> not content at finding themselves in this great error, work with indirect means that other subjects of this most serene Dominion sell their own substance and their goods, abandon their fatherland, and bestow the receipts of the sale on their associates abroad; for this manner of proceeding these

[62] Cittadella had been a center of evangelical opposition to the anti-Trinitarian movement in 1551, having at that time refused to go along with the conclusions of the council at Venice, Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista," *op. cit.*, 85; cf. DeWind, *op. cit.*, 31.

[63] Comba, *Protestanti,* 537-38; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 45.

[64] Comba, *Protestanti,* 539-40, citing letter of Lando to Captain at Trieste: Capodistria, August 28, 1562.

[65] Todeschi, who knew something about Moravia from a personal visit, (Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 45), described it as follows: "It is a congregation having goods in common and composed of various persons who may number around 30,000 of various nationalities: men, women, and children; Germans, Hungarians, Poles, Paduans, Vicentines, Trevisans and other nations. . . . Those who enter into that community sell all that they have and give the money gained thereby for the benefit of the congregation; and if the men have a trade, they put them to work at it, and the women to their occupations, and the children to reading and writing; and if any wishes later to leave he cannot have a farthing of the common goods, even if he had disbursed 10,000 ducats." From information given to Lando, August 27, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti,* 539, n. 1.

men have correspondents in many cities and places of this most serene Dominion and other foreign places.

This Captain Lando had learned from some seized papers.[66]

Francesco della Sega and his companions were now conducted to Venice where they were imprisoned in San Giovanni in Bragora, the same prison which housed Giulio Gherlandi.[67] Gherlandi, apparently recognizing della Sega's voice, called to him first in German then in Italian. The two had further communication while in the same prison, though perhaps without actually seeing each other face to face. A few weeks after della Sega's admission to the prison and after he had undergone his first interrogation, Gherlandi was sentenced to be executed, and della Sega could not have remained long in ignorance of this decision.

Della Sega's first interrogation by the Inquisitorial court in Venice took place on September 26, 1562. In this session della Sega provided his questioners with basic information about himself and his situation: his name, his father's name, his place of origin, his profession, his most recent place of residence, the fact that he was married and had a son, both wife and son being in Moravia, the occasion of his trip to Italy, the circumstances of his arrest, the fact that in Moravia they owed allegiance to the Emperor but governed themselves, and the fact that he and his family lived in a *Haushaben* of 150 persons, most of whom were Germans. On points of doctrine della Sega gave vague answers to his questioners, except in the case of the sacrament of the Supper, which he indicated was regarded as a commemorative service. When the questioners grew insistent, della Sega finally determined to make a full statement in writing, and having been given permission to do so, drew up a confession, dated October 20, 1562, in which he described the circumstances of his early life, his conversion, and the manner in which he had come to join the Hutterites. We have already cited this confession on these points.

But della Sega went on to state his convictions on several articles of faith. For example, he made it clear that he believed that man is saved by faith, not by works, and that baptism is a holy sacrament but is invalid unless received by a man in full awareness of its implications. His statement clearly defends believer's baptism. On the question of salvation of unbaptized children, he con-

[66] Information obtained by Inquisition from Captain Lando at Capodistria, dated August 27, 1562, *ibid.*, 539.

[67] *Ibid.*, 540; Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 46. Neither supplies the source for the material included in this paragraph.

fessed some doubts, but, after citing evidence from the Scriptures that salvation is possible in certain cases without baptism, left the question open, saying that he did not presume to understand the ways and will of God. On most other points, says Comba, della Sega did not deviate from the usual Protestant teachings. Concerning the Supper he said that unworthy persons should not partake of it. Of confession he asserted that it should be made to God, not to any human agent. He finished by reconfirming his conviction that he cared nothing for doctrinal subtleties but stood on the belief in God and observance of His commandments. Della Sega's confession hid nothing from the court save the names of other brethren; it was all that the court required to convict him of heresy.

The Inquisitors now turned to the task of persuading della Sega to recant. To this end a number of theologians, including the famed Spanish Jesuit Salmeron, engaged in a series of disputations with the prisoner. Throughout these sessions della Sega remained steadfast, although he was willing to recognize his errors when shown them on the basis of Scripture. His foundation was Scripture:

> I have set my life and my faith in Scripture, nor have I departed from the holy church, but from the evil one, and I have sought to unite myself with the good one; if I have made some error that I have overlooked I shall admit it only if it is shown to me with Holy Scripture, because I desire to live a Christian life.[68]

In disputations which followed this one della Sega clarified his position on some of the essentials of the evangelic faith. He subscribed wholeheartedly to the doctrine of justification by faith alone, reiterated his stand on infant baptism, and added some account of his attitude toward the Roman Church and the power of remitting sins. On the latter point he says:

> I confess the authority of the holy church and of each particular member of it of pardoning sins . . . because He Himself has given this power to His church of pardoning sins . . . ; but that congregation or church that does not live according to Christ or observe His commandments is not of Christ, nor has it any power from Christ, but it is in the power of sin and of the devil which it obeys. And because I am asked concerning the Roman Church and the Pope and their councils whether they are the Church of Christ I respond: Since the Church of Christ should be holy, without wrinkle and spot of sin, and ought in no manner to admit or support evildoers as its members so that it will not participate in the sins of others, therefore I hold that the Roman Church of the Pope is not the Church of Christ by reason of this, that it contains within it blasphemers, fools,

[68] Interrogation of January 7, 1563, Comba, *Protestanti*, 547.

slanderers, drunken ones, fornicators, shameful persons, the proud, the pompous, the disputatious and many others of like nature who are not of Christ but of the devil. And concerning councils I say nothing since I have not seen them.[69]

It was about this time (early in 1563)[70] that della Sega wrote a letter to his fellow believers in Moravia.[71] It seems to have been especially directed to Leonhard Sailer (Lanzenstiel) and Peter Scherer (Walpot), although it was intended to be read by or to the community in general. I translate the portions quoted by Benrath and Comba:

I do not wish to permit the occasion to pass while I am yet in this tabernacle of desiring for you the grace of the salvation of the omnipotent God. I have loved you all sincerely; but I love you even more now that I have been deprived of your presence, which deprivation is a great tribulation to me. And when the end comes, I will love you with the love that I have through Christ Himself, because you are members of His body, yes, bone of His bone, flesh of His flesh. And you have loved me sincerely; through you I have received of God innumerable benefits for which I have not repaid you, and thus I remain your debtor. But I desire to bear this my humiliation with patience, for love of you; yes, I would, through love of you, bear being rejected and excommunicated and finally led to execution.

The letter concludes with exhortations directed to the pastors and to the community as a whole, as well as to della Sega's fellow Italians who had joined the group. He admonished the latter that they should never abandon the church, keeping always before their eyes the parable of the vine.

Think what grace you have received from God through being led from the deepest shadows to His marvelous light, and love one another with a pure heart, with all sincerity and fullness of heart, without pretense.

The letter ends with greetings to his friends,[72] to his wife, and to his mother-in-law, Florentina.

The Inquisitors now left della Sega to lie in his prison for a long time, evidently relying on the persuasions of such confinement to bring him to reason. He must not have been completely cut off from news of the outside world, however, for a year later, in April, 1564, when the Venetian Council of Ten decreed that heretics

[69] Interrogation of March 2, 1563, *ibid.*, 547-48.

[70] The letter refers to arguments with theologians, Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 48.

[71] Benrath, who quotes portions of the letter, *ibid.*, 48-50, says it is known only in a German translation—the original being lost—and is extant in two German libraries, *ibid.*, 45. It was the source of the information on Gherlandi's death contained in the Hutterite *Geschichts-Bücher;* see Beck, *op. cit.*, 240, n. 1, and R. Wolkan, *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Wien, 1923) 315, n. 3. Comba did not use either of the copies referred to by Benrath but simply followed the latter's version, *Protestanti,* 545-46.

[72] Benrath names them, "Wiedertäufer," 49, 50.

should be expelled from the territory of the Republic,[73] word of it reached the prisoner, creating in him the hope that he might profit by it. In the fervent hope that the decree might be made to apply to him, della Sega on July 18, 1564, addressed a petition to the Inquisitorial court urging it to intercede with the governor to free him under terms of the decree. In this communication[74] the prisoner entreated the Council of Ten to avoid further shedding of blood of heretics. He admitted that he was a heretic, but showed them on the basis of the Gospels and writings of the apostles that heretics should be shunned, excommunicated or dismissed but allowed to live. He concluded by praising the wisdom of the government of Venice in that it proposed to show such great mercy, a thing almost unheard-of and calculated to set the Republic far above the civilization of the ancient Romans. Della Sega's hopes were in vain and his case was reopened late in 1564.[75]

Early in November, 1564, the Inquisitor Fra Adriano, who had earlier endeavored to persuade della Sega to recant, prepared a report on the case. In this report he enumerated the chief heresies of della Sega and Rizzetto, which he considered to be the following: their designation of the Moravian instead of the Roman as the true church; their rejection of infant baptism and auricular confession to priests; and the consummated union of the accused with the community of brethren in Moravia.[76]

A further attempt was now made to bring the prisoners to recant, and in an interrogation on December 12, 1564, the following interview with della Sega took place:

> What is your opinion? Do you admit that you have gravely offended the majesty of God by thus stubbornly maintaining rebellion against the holy faith? Do you not want to turn away from your errors?
>
> I desire to live a Christian life, and should I be guilty of some error, I wish to correct it and to believe and act as Christ teaches me.
>
> Do you believe in the body of Christ?
>
> This is not an article of faith and it is not in the Symbol because Christ has ascended into heaven. He has instituted the Supper in His memory; He is not really there within it.

[73] The decree was dated April 7, 1564. It is summarized in C. Cantú, *Gli eretici d'Italia* (Torino, 1865-66) III, 139; see Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 50, and Comba, *Protestanti,* 548.

[74] Comba prints excerpts, *ibid.,* 549; Benrath provides a German translation of the full letter, "Wiedertäufer," 64-67.

[75] Benrath, *ibid.,* 51, and Comba, *Protestanti,* 549, n. 2, suggest that this was because Pope Pius IV now accused the Venetian authorities of too great leniency with heretics. Cantú, however, claims that the decree followed the Pope's warning, *op. cit.,* III, 139.

[76] Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 51.

Then you are a notorious heretic, convinced, confessed, stubborn, impenitent. Do you desire to make some juridical defense in order not to be condemned?

If the word of Christ and His doctrine do not defend me, I will make no other defense.

But do you not wish to prove these things you have confessed by some other means?

I believe what Christ and His apostles teach.

Do you not then believe that what the Catholic Church holds is that which Christ has also ordained to His apostles?

I believe more readily in Christ, who has said "in commemoration," than in the Church.[77]

On December 5, 1564, Nicola Buccella was persuaded by the court to abjure,[78] but Rizzetto remained steadfast. Della Sega, when confronted by the final penalty, hesitated a moment, for on February 8, 1565, the sentence was passed upon him as an impenitent Anabaptist heretic, worthy of death, who, together with Rizzetto was to be cast into the sea.[79] When an officer came to della Sega to lead him to his punishment, he wavered, saying, "I do not want to be drowned, but to retract and to die a good Christian."[80] The captain quickly reported this apparent change of mind to the court and an Inquisitor entered to speak with him again.[81] The Inquisitor admonished della Sega that if he wished to be a member of the Church of Rome, it was necessary that he confess that that Church was a body whose head is Christ in heaven, whose earthly vicar is the Pope, and that he further must make known the names of his accomplices. This warning cast della Sega into silent agitation which he broke by saying, "I am not decided, and for that reason I cannot answer, and when my doubts have been settled for me, I shall reply. Meanwhile, none of my accomplices are in these parts."[82]

Two days later della Sega was called before the court. They addressed him as follows:

This Sacred Court has waited these past days with its great consolation due to the information presented by Captain Chiaramonte, who went by order of this Holy Office to execute the sentence pronounced against you in the event that you did not wish to correct yourself of your impiety and to recant; you responded that you desired to recant and to live and die a

77 Comba, *Protestanti,* 549-50.

78 Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 51.

79 Benrath quotes portions of the sentence, *ibid.,* 52, 53; Comba, *Protestanti,* 554.

80 According to Comba, *ibid.,* 550, n. 2, this occurred on February 17, but Rizzetto was informed of della Sega's hesitation as early as February 12, *ibid.,* 599.

81 Again the Jesuit Salmeron was assigned to reason with della Sega, Benrath, "Wiedertäufer," 52.

82 Interrogation of February 20, 1565, Comba, *Protestanti,* 550-51.

good Christian. But now our consolation has been somewhat saddened, since we have understood through the report of the Reverend Father Inquisitor that you remain yet suspended and that you have said that you are not resolved; moreover, this Sacred Court has caused you to come here personally and, not departing in any point from the sentence already delivered against you, wishes to know what is your will in order to do later as much as justice will permit, accompanied by that mercy that this pious and holy office ordinarily uses with the truly penitent.

To this della Sega responded, "I would wish to have yet a little time." The record says, however, that he here added several words that did not demonstrate any sign of penitence. Nevertheless the Court delayed the execution until the night of Monday, February 26, intending to use the intervening days to make one last effort to move the prisoner to repentance.[83]

During those last days della Sega searched his conscience and returned in wholeness of heart to his faith. This is clearly shown by the testament which he drew up and addressed to his mother and brothers in Italy:

I do not desire to be released from my prison for the sake of living, like you, according to the world. I have chosen the better part, which will not be taken away from me. I go as a sheep which is sent to the slaughter, but I call upon the testimony of heaven and earth . . . because I have paid my debts to you, having sought your salvation many times when I was free. But you have despised the voice of God. And while you have known that I was in prison, you have not deigned to notice me, nor even to find out if I was alive or dead; you have not aided me with even a loaf, although you have my goods in your hands. I am moreover your brother and we have sprung from the same blood, which has turned to water. You are moreover cruel to me. And that would prove already that you are Christians neither little nor enough; I do not say this, however, to my venerated mother. May God pardon you and call you to repentance. I pray you for the last time to consider why you have come into the world, and calling yourselves Christians, to do what Christ teaches. No, you do not do it. I exhort you still to desire His grace and to observe His commandments. I pray it of you with all my heart, now that I am about to die. In place of my last testament, since I have no money to leave, that which I have and know for divine grace, I manifest to you, and anew with great sorrow of heart and with tears in my eyes, I plead with you to seek God while He is to be found. Be not deceived: your life is contrary to His law. You confound the Pope's religion with that of Christ, and this is a grave error. The Roman Catholic religion is composed for the most part of Judaism and paganism; it is not of Christ. In every manner we see that the commandments that the Roman Church takes from Christ and from His apostles are not at all observed by those who command them; but the commandments of the Pope and of men are observed. Examine these things; they have to do with your everlasting salvation. Let not yourself be guided by the blind if you do not wish to fall into the infernal pit. And do not put off your conversion, because we do not know what tomorrow will bring. Think that if God is merciful, His

[83] Interrogation of February 22, 1565, *ibid.*, 551-52.

wrath is great towards the rebellious. . . . Now, if this letter should not please you, I know nought else to say. God will not save you by force. It remains to me, in this case, to ask you only to pass this letter to some other who may have the desire to do good and live a Christian life.[84]

This letter rests in the Inquisitorial Archives, mute testimony to the loving concern, not unmixed with sternness, that filled della Sega's heart for his family in his last days. For at the appointed time he was transported to the lagoon and in the customary manner cast into the depths of the sea.[85]

Antonio Rizzetto (d. 1565)[86]

Antonio Rizzetto was a native of Vicenza or its environs. We know neither the date of his birth nor the occupation in which he engaged. We do know that around 1551 or 1552 he was living in the territory of Vicenza with his wife and children.[87] We possess these facts about him because in 1562 he testified that about ten years earlier he had been baptized in his house by Marc' Antonio of Asolo,[88] one of the evangelical anti-Trinitarians active in north Italy around that time. Rizzetto made it clear that only he and his wife, and not his children, had then undergone baptism.[89] Late in 1551 the Inquisition began to move against members of this sect, and Rizzetto, his wife having died, left north Italy to seek refuge in Thessalonica. He made the journey in the company of a friend, Bartolomeo of Padua, and Bartolomeo's wife and daughter,[90] either late in 1551 or early in 1552. Bartolomeo died in Thessalonica and Rizzetto married his widow, Caterina de Porti.[91]

[84] The exact date of this testament is uncertain. Comba prints a portion of it, *ibid.*, 552-53. It is also printed in V. Bellondi, *I battisti, pagine della Inquisizione veneta,* (Rome, 1881), but I have not seen this work. Benrath describes this letter as "eines der bemerkenswertesten Schriftstücke aus dem Bereiche der anabaptistischen Bewegung," "Wiedertäufer," 52.

[85] *Ibid.*, 53; Comba, *Protestanti,* 554; Beck, *op. cit.,* 243.

[86] Our information on Rizzetto is drawn from Comba, *Protestanti,* 589-602. Comba used documents from the Venetian Inquisitorial Archives, S. Uffizio, Busta 18, but does not print his sources in full. These records are in fact incomplete on Rizzetto's case, *Protestanti,* 594. Bellondi, *I battisti, op. cit.,* evidently prints more of them. The following account therefore leans heavily on Comba.

[87] Interrogation of October, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti,* 596, 597-98.

[88] *Ibid.* Marc'Antonio was a companion of Pietro Manelfi, the renegade anti-Trinitarian; see Manelfi's second deposition, Rome, November 12, 1551, Comba, "Un sinodo anabattista."

[89] Interrogation of October, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti,* 596.

[90] The evidence throughout is unclear concerning the movements of Rizzetto's children.

[91] Comba, *Protestanti,* 592.

Rizzetto remained in Thessalonica for some time but eventually returned to Italy, leaving Caterina and their daughter Paola there to await whatever arrangements he might make for them. His return may have been prompted by a letter from Francesco della Sega to the refugees in Thessalonica.[91a] Then in 1561 he went to Moravia with "Bartolomeo of Ferrara and with a lady named Lucrezia, a Vicentine, and with one of my daughters."[92] He went, says Rizzetto, "because I had learned that there were there good people who lived saintly lives; and seeing their lives and actions, I was pleased, and thus I determined to remain there and I stayed and I left my daughter there."[93]

Rizzetto now made arrangements to have his wife and stepdaughter join him. To this end he traveled to Italy with Francesco della Sega on his 1562 journey and while in Italy paid over the sum of twenty-five ducats to the cap-maker della Vecchia of Venice, this money to be transmitted to a Jew named Moses Monchiaro—probably a merchant engaged in trade with the east—who was to bring Caterina and Paola Rizzetto from Thessalonica to Venice, after which they might decide to join him in Moravia.[94] He was himself about to return to Moravia with della Sega and a number of other persons when the dispute with Alessio Todeschi over a sum of money caused the latter to give information to the authorities at Capodistria, whereupon Rizzetto, della Sega, Nicola Buccella, and Rizzetto's young son were arrested.[95]

Rizzetto was questioned at Capodistria, then separated from his son and sent with della Sega to prison in Venice.[96] There in the month of October, 1562, he was questioned several times by the Inquisitorial Court. Besides providing the personal information we have cited, these interrogations contain some descriptions given by Rizzetto to the court about the Moravian community and its beliefs. The ceremonies and teachings connected with baptism and the Lord's Supper especially interested the Court and Rizzetto was pushed into a lively defense of adult baptism. He further asserted, when asked about the position of the Pope, that Christ had given the power of the keys to all the apostles, not to

91a Beck, *op. cit.*, 211.

92 Interrogation of October, 1562, Comba, *Protestanti*, 595.

93 *Ibid.*

94 Rizzetto's deposition to the Podestá (mayor) at Capodistria at time of his arrest in August, 1562. This evidence was expanded in the October interrogation, *ibid.*, 597.

95 *Ibid.*, 594.

96 *Ibid.*

Peter alone.[97] This testimony sufficed to condemn Rizzetto in the eyes of the judges:

> But do you know that we hold you for a very great Anabaptist heretic? Think while you have time to leave these your pestiferous opinions; otherwise you will be proceeded against in the manner used against stubborn heretics.[98]

But Rizzetto on this occasion and in later interviews denied holding wrong beliefs in spite of the arguments of the theologians. His case was described by Father Adriano, the Inquisitor who also examined della Sega, as that of a man "ignorant, hard, without reason."[99] For two years Rizzetto was allowed to lie in his prison, and when we hear of him again, it is from the pen of an Inquisitorial visitor who repeated the judgment that he continued "hard, obstinate, impenitent."[100]

Perhaps the greatest trial Rizzetto had to bear occurred when the court persuaded his twelve-year-old son (who had been taken prisoner along with his father and brought to side with the authorities) to go in to his father and plead with him to recant so as to save his life. Despite the emotions that this situation must have engendered, Rizzetto told his son that the true Christian is prepared to renounce possessions, children, and life itself rather than go against his conscience.[101]

There was one final test. The sentence of death was passed upon Rizzetto simultaneously with della Sega on February 8, 1565.[102] The officer assigned to carry out the sentence informed Rizzetto that della Sega was considering an abjuration. Rizzetto was much disturbed but said, "Unhappy soul! But if he has lost his soul, I do not wish to lose mine, and what I have said, I have said." While he was being led to his execution, they exhorted him further, but he only replied by saying, "Do your deed."[103] Thus Rizzetto died without knowing for sure whether della Sega had recanted.[104]

Comba describes the tragic and moving scene of the execution. As the boats moved silently towards the sea, the priest who ac-

[97] *Ibid.*, 595-96.
[98] *Ibid.*, 596-97.
[99] Interrogation of February 5, 1563, *ibid.*, 598.
[100] Interrogation of January 12, 1565, *ibid.*
[101] *Ibid.*
[102] *Ibid.*, 554.
[103] Executioner's report, February 12, 1565, *ibid.*, 599.
[104] Benrath thus errs in saying that della Sega and Rizzetto died together, "Wiedertäufer," 53; the latter preceded the former by around two weeks.

companied Rizzetto urged him to kiss the Crucifix as a sign of reconciliation with the Church, but Rizzetto warned those with him to rise from the trap in which they found themselves and to come to Christ, under penalty of eternal damnation. When they reached the appropriate place in the lagoon, the officer bound Rizzetto's hands. Rizzetto asked for his cloak, whereupon the boatman mockingly said, "What, are you afraid of the cold? How will it be then when you find yourself at the bottom of the sea? Save yourself while you have the chance. Even chickens flee death." To which Rizzetto replied, "I do flee death, as you say, but eternal death."

The boat at length stopped. The officer passed around Rizzetto's waist a chain attached to a heavy stone. Rizzetto turned his face to the sky and cried, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." As he was placed lengthwise on a plank between the two boats, he said, "O God, into Thy hands I remit my spirit." Then, without waiting for the boats to pull apart, he rolled himself over off the plank into the sea.[105] In the *Geschichts-Bücher* of the Hutterites the fate of Rizzetto and della Sega is simply told: "They were engulfed in the sea in the year 1565, but the sea will render up its dead in the day of the judgment of God."[106]

[105] Executioner's report, Comba, *Protestanti,* 599,600.

[106] Beck, *op. cit.,* 243. The *Geschichts-Bücher,* 249, tell of one Hans Geörg (Gian Giorgio), a count from a noble Venetian family, who had lived for a year with the community in Moravia, but who was executed in Venice in 1566. Th. van Braght includes this account of Gian Giorgio: "In the year 1566 brother Hans George, Count of Grootenstein, in Italy, who some years before had fled to Germany, and had conducted himself in the church of God as becometh a Christian in all humility, returned to Italy where he had left his wife. Being betrayed, he was taken into custody by persons from Venice. As they drew near to Venice by water, he was thrown overboard and drowned. It was thus secretly done to avoid any disturbance on account of his high birth." T. van Braght, *Martyrology of the Churches of Christ commonly called Baptists, during the Era of the Reformation,* edited for the Hanserd Knollys Society by E. B. Underhill (London, 1853) II, 425. No records on this case appear to exist in the Venetian Archives; they were perhaps omitted in order to protect the count's noble family. The 1951 edition of the *Martyrs Mirror* (Scottdale) contains the same account in variant translation, p. 703.

THE ANABAPTIST DOCTRINE OF THE RESTITUTION OF THE CHURCH

FRANK J. WRAY*

The recovery of the characteristics of the early church was the goal of both Reformers and Anabaptists, but there was a difference in the approach to the problem. The key concept of the Reformers was *reformatio*. From their point of view the remnant remained within the Great Church. The task at hand was to free the Great Church from the control of the papal Antichrist and to remove the abominations which had been introduced. The fundamental concept among Anabaptists was *restitutio*. The medieval church was beyond hope. The children of God must be recalled from exile. They must rebuild the true church upon apostolic foundations. They must separate themselves from the fallen church, which was now the church of Antichrist. One must note, however, that the two approaches differed in degree rather than in kind. Both points of view aimed at removing corruption, but they reflect differences of opinion as to how early the fall took place and how drastic the effects were.

The idea of returning to the apostolic pattern was adumbrated by Erasmus, who frequently upbraided the sixteenth century church by comparison with that of the apostles. Yet Erasmus' belief that the depravity of the heretics had forced an accommodation on the part of the church[1] suggests that a complete return to the age of the apostles might be either undesirable or impossible.

Zwingli, in his early days of reform, spoke much about the return to apostolic standards. In 1522 he wrote that the doctrines he was teaching were 1522 years old. Everything should be tried by the touchstone of the Gospel and the fire of Paul. Those things in harmony with the Gospel are to be kept; those not in harmony with the Gospel are to be rejected.[2] Zwingli refused, in practice, however, to make as radical a break with the past as these premises would logically demand. But within Zwingli's circle arose the Swiss Breth-

* A chapter from the unpublished Yale University doctoral dissertation (1953), "History in the Eyes of the Sixteenth-Century Anabaptists," by Frank J. Wray, Professor of History at Berea College, Berea, Kentucky.

[1] R. H. Bainton, *Concerning Heretics* (New York, 1935) 33-34.

[2] "Apologeticus Archeteles Adpellatus quo respondetur paraenesi a Rev. Domino Constantiensi," *Huldrici Zwingli Opera*, ed. by M. Schuler and J. Schulthess (Zürich, 1829-42) III, 36, 70.

ren, who did demand a thoroughgoing adherence to the apostolic pattern.

In the sixteenth century a number of radicals, with an eye upon Acts 3:21, actually employed the term "restitution." Campanus, Rothmann, and Servetus used the word in the titles of books. David Joris entitled a portion of his *'T Wonder-boeck* "Van der Restitution offt weederbrenginghe een weynich."[3] Dirk Philips wrote a tract called *Van de geestlijcke Restitution,*[4] which was in part directed against the type of restitution advocated at Münster. We also find the term used by Hendrick Niclaes, the founder of the Familist movement, and by William Postell, who is perhaps best classed among the free spirits.[5] Although it appears that the term was employed more frequently by those on the fringe of Anabaptism than by representatives of the main stream of the movement, it represents, nevertheless, an attitude which pervaded the whole movement.

The difference between the attitude of the Reformers and that of the Anabaptists is well illustrated in the minutes of the debate in Bern in 1538. The argument of the Zwinglian preachers was based on the assertion, frequently repeated, that the True Church has remained within the visible church even under the papacy. The Great Church was the church of the apostles even though it had been so badly corrupted that it could scarcely be recognized. Christ still remained the foundation of this church and the articles of faith were still preserved.[6] The preachers claimed that their own ordination was valid even though it had been received under the papacy. They claimed that their mission was not from the pope but from Christ first and then from the True Church, which in spite of the pope had not disappeared.[7] God had revealed to the preachers the errors into which the church had fallen, and they had undertaken to purify it from the papacy. They pointed out that they, the preachers, not the Anabaptists, were the ones who had overthrown the errors of the Mass and other corruptions.[8] The pope and the cardinals do not represent the True Church. The preachers had sepa-

[3] Part II, fol. 181 verso ff.

[4] *Bibliographia Reformatoria Neerlandica* (The Hague, 1914), X, 338-76.

[5] On the use of the term "restitution" see Roland H. Bainton, "Changing Ideas and Ideals in the Sixteenth Century," *Journal of Modern History,* VIII (1936) 417 ff., especially 428-29. See also K. Rembert, *Die "Wiedertäufer" im Herzogtum Jülich* (Berlin, 1899) 242 f.

[6] *Acta Des gesprächs. . . . Inn der Statt Bern, 1538,* 28-29. Ms. copy in Goshen College Library.

[7] *Ibid.,* 34.

[8] *Ibid.,* 38.

rated themselves only from the papacy and its errors, not from the church.[9]

The Anabaptists likewise claimed that they had not separated themselves from the True Christian Church,[10] but they based their argument upon the re-establishment of the apostolic pattern. The Great Church had been so darkened by the papacy that it could not longer be regarded as a Christian church. It no longer possessed apostolic institutions.[11] One must return to the original foundations of the church.[12] Only those who receive the Gospel, abstain from error, and follow the Christian life are true Christians. Therefore, Anabaptists had been compelled to establish a church in every way agreeable to that of the Apostles. The True Church had ceased for a time, but the Anabaptists had made a new beginning.[13] This is not a new church but a restoration of that established by Christ.[14] Since the Roman Church was no longer a true church, the Anabaptists refused to recognize the validity of the ordination of preachers under the papacy.[15] True preachers can be sent only by a pure and holy church.[16] Hence, the Anabaptist preachers, not the Zwinglians, were the true missionaries of Christ.[17]

The idea of a restitution as distinguished from a reformation appeared among other Anabaptists. In 1529 the preachers at Strasbourg presented to the Council a document in which they attempted to refute the teachings of Jacob Kautz and William Reublin. Among the quotations from Kautz is one which reads as follows: "Now Kautz and his [associates] say, to assemble the church there is first need for a pastor whose call is heavenly, from God, and not earthly, from men, who also is bound to no place, person, or element, to go into all the world to assemble the scattered sheep from among the Jews and heathen; then [there is need for] the preaching of the Gospel, and then, when such is heard and received, outward baptism."[18] In other words, the present task is exactly the same as that which faced the apostles immediately after the ascension.

The idea of a restitution is also implied in Riedemann's great *Rechenschaft* of 1540. In order to be reconciled with God, one must

[9] *Ibid.*, 51, 72, 73.
[10] *Ibid.*, 80.
[11] *Ibid.*, 30.
[12] *Ibid.*, 34.
[13] *Ibid.*, 34, 52.
[14] *Ibid.*, 49.
[15] *Ibid.*, 33.
[16] *Ibid.*, 43.
[17] *Ibid.*, 52.
[18] Unpublished collection of Alsace Anabaptist archival documents, edited by Karl Adam, Part II, 98 f.

separate himself from the godless company which has been corrupted by the papacy. Riedemann compared the re-establishment of the True Church to the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem after the return from Babylon. Those who refused to separate themselves from the old church were compared to the ancient Jews who refused to put away their foreign wives. Nehemiah 13:23 ff. Like Zerubbabel, modern rebuilders of God's house must refuse to let the heathen share in the task.[19]

Dirk Philips also used the rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah and Zerubbabel as a figure for the restitution of the True Church. Dirk pointed out in particular that the second temple was rebuilt in the original form and on the original foundations of the temple of Solomon. "This happens now all in the spirit," wrote Dirk, "since now the temple of the Lord, the church of God, will be built upon the first foundation, upon the ground of the prophets and the apostles, of which Christ is the keystone."[20] Now there are true servants of the Holy Word who will restore the ordinances and doctrines of the apostles. Like Riedemann, Dirk pointed out that this task is for the Israelites alone. The heathen, that is the princes of this world and the scholars, are to have no part in it.[21]

David Joris also used this figure to represent the restitution which initiates his third age.[22]

The identifying marks of the restored church are the opposite of those of the fallen church. As we would expect, the Anabaptists emphasized the same issues in describing the restitution as they had done in speaking of the fall. Thus, for example, Hubmaier thought in terms of the restoration of baptism and the Supper in their original form and significance.[23] Likewise, Marpeck wrote that as soon as the True Christian baptism is re-established, the church will be purified and the regime of Antichrist destroyed.[24] The Hutterite hymn writer Hans Raifer called attention to the restoration of com-

19 P. Rideman, *Account of Our Religion, Doctrine, and Faith* (Bridgnorth, 1950) 149-53.

20 *BRN*, X, 371.

21 *Ibid.*, X, 372 f.

22 D. Joris, *'T Wonder-boeck* (Deventer, 1542) fol. 59-60.

23 W. O. Lewis and G. D. Davidson, "The Writings of Balthasar Hubmaier," unpublished translation (1939) in William Jewell College Library, Liberty, Mo., 249-51, 328-62; J. Loserth, *Balthasar Hubmaier* (Brno, 1893) 122.

24 P. Marpeck, *Vermanung* (n.p., n.d. [1542]) fol. Kij verso. The point was suggested by Rothmann. but is expanded in the *Vermanung;* see H. Detmer and R. Krumbholtz, *Zwei Schriften des Münsterischen Wiedertäufer Bernhard Rothmann* (Dortmund, 1904) 55.

munity of goods.[25] The first edition of the *Ausbund* also contained a hymn which stressed community of goods,[26] but later editions dropped it, probably as a result of a dispute on this question between the Swiss Brethren and the Hutterites.[27] The Anabaptist participants in the debate at Bern in 1538 called for the apostolic pattern in general and in particular the ban.[28] Menno Simons and Dirk Philips included a number of points, but they emphasized the ordinances of baptism and the Supper and the use of the ban.[29] As a whole the evangelical Anabaptists regarded the following as marks of the restored True Church: believer's baptism, the symbolic use of the Supper, the ban, separation from the world, sharing of goods, nonresistance, and refusal to swear a solemn oath.[30] All of the marks point to one major characteristic: a fellowship of believers gathered and disciplined according to the pattern which Anabaptists found in the New Testament.

The radical Münsterites also claimed to restore the teachings of Christ. According to Rothmann the prerequisites of the restitution were a right understanding of Christ, the keeping of His doctrines, and holding to His promises.[31] Rothmann, however, regarded the Old and New Testaments as a single unit, of which the Pentateuch was the most important.[32] Accordingly the Münsterites sought to re-establish not only adult baptism,[33] community of goods,[34] and the symbolic use of the Supper,[35] but also "true Christian government" and the "true" doctrine of marriage. By true Christian government they meant the literal restoration of the throne of David by the new Israel. The new David must wield the sword of righteousness. He must exercise the office of the first David; hence he and his followers are the agents of God who must defeat and destroy the enemies of the restored kingdom.[36] The true doctrine of mar-

[25] "Mein Eifer tut mich dringen," *Lieder der Hutterischen Brüder* (Scottdale, 1914) 596.

[26] "Wir schreyen zu dir Herre Gott," *Etliche schöne Christliche Geseng* (1564) fol. 28 f.

[27] R. Wolkan, *Geschicht-Buch der Hutterischen Brüder* (Standoff Colony bei Macleod, 1923) 324.

[28] *Acta Des gesprächs. . . Inn der Statt Bern, 1538,* 121 f.

[29] *Complete Works of Menno Simons* (Scottdale, 1950) *passim,* especially II, 70, 103; *BRN,* X, 372.

[30] F. H. Littell, *The Anabaptist View of the Church* (American Society of Church History, 1952) 76-91.

[31] B. Rothmann, *Restitution und gesunder Lehr* (reprint, Halle, 1888) 50.

[32] *Ibid.,* 121; W. H. Hochmuth, *Bernhard Rothmanns Schriften* (Gotha, 1857) 16.

[33] Restitution, 43-46.

[34] *Ibid.,* 70-71.

[35] *Ibid.,* 72-75.

[36] *Ibid.,* 104; K. Bouterwek, "Zur Literatur und Geschichte der Wiedertäufer," *Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins,* I (1863), 353, 357, 358.

riage involved the freedom which the patriarchs had enjoyed and which the Münsterites claimed that Paul supported to practice polygamy.[37] In short, the "restitution of all things" was a literal resurrection of the ancient regime which had characterized the Kingdom of Israel, not, as with other Anabaptists, the pattern of the apostolic church.

In contrast to the Reformers and Anabaptists, some of the free thinkers saw no hope of a restoration of Christianity short of the end of the world. Those who attempted to do so were accused of acting without divine commission. This point of view was reflected in the title of a book by Johannes Bünderlin in 1530: *Erklarung durch vergleichung der Biblischen geschrifft, das der wassertauff sampt anderen eüsserlichen gebräuchen in der Apostolischen Kirchen geübet. On Gottes befelch un zeügniss der gschrifft, von etlichen diser zeit, wider erfert wirt. Seiten mal der Antichrist dieselben all zehand nach d'Apostel abgang verwustet hat. Welche verwüstung dan biss an das end bleibt.*[38] In his letter to Campanus, Sebastian Franck wrote that the present church is entirely spiritual. No one is permitted to re-establish the visible church and its sacraments without a special outward calling such as Christ gave to His disciples.[39] For Schwenckfeld the restitution extended only to the free preaching of the Gospel. It did not include the establishment of a disciplined community of believers.[40]

The principal answer of the evangelical Anabaptists to those who denied that such an apostolic church could be revived is found in Marpeck's *Verantwortung,* a reply to Schwenckfeld's *Judicium.* Marpeck regarded the commands of Christ as valid in the present as in the time of the apostles. The present believers have the same power to assemble a body of Christ through His Spirit as the apostles had. The church still stands upon its original foundation and power or mission. There is no new commission, nor will there be one. Neither may one stand still. The Lord still grants even today a knowledge of the truth, the same as to the apostles.[41] The Anabaptists now have God's grace of faith, the love of God, and the true understanding of Christian baptism and of the washing away

[37] *Restitution,* 83 ff.; A. Corvinus, *Gespreche und Disputation* (Wittenberg, 1536) fol. fij recto.

[38] F. O. zur Linden, *Melchior Hofmann, ein Prophet der Wiedertäufer* (Haarlem, 1885) 25n.

[39] Rembert, *op. cit.,* 220.

[40] Littell, *op. cit.,* 98.

[41] J. Loserth, *Quellen und Forschungen* (Vienna, 1929) 78, 104, 105.

of sin. "Therefore, with us," wrote Marpeck, "just as in the time of the apostles, is a true church of Christ."[42]

Hans Denk and David Joris stood closer to Franck and Schwenckfeld on this point than to other Anabaptists. For them restitution was less a problem of gathering a church than it was a restoration of the true knowledge of God. Both Denk and Joris worked at the former task only to abandon it toward the end of their lives. For them a particular charàcteristic of the restitution was the rejection of human wisdom and philosophy and a literal interpretation of the Scriptures. One must seek the true faith from God and Christ. In other words, one must interpret the Outer Word by the Inner Light. Such was the point of Denk's tract *Wer die warheit warlich lieb hat.* At the end of this work Denk quoted Isaiah 29:11, 12 and remarked that this prophecy is fulfilled in the present time. We understand the sealed book of the mystery of God less than a dumb animal understands our speech. Only the Master has the key to this sealed book.[43] If we would be blessed, according to Denk, we must bewail our poverty and hunger for the bread of life.[44]

Using the same passage from Isaiah, Joris concluded that the mystery is sealed to the doctors and scholars but that God has revealed it to the small and simple men.[45] In the part of the *'T Wonder-boeck* which deals with the restitution, Joris declared that it is necessary to turn our eyes from slyness and our own wisdom to simpleness.[46] He warned us not to wander into matters beyond our grasp.[47]

Where and when did the process of restoring the fallen church begin? Who was responsible for initiating this work and who has carried it on? Luther took particular notice of the efforts of Jean Gerson (1363-1429) to curb the pretensions of the papacy. Gerson was "the first whom our Lord God began to enlighten in this last age of the world."[48] Protestant historians generally agreed that God had sent Wyclif and Hus to prepare the way for Luther.[49] John Foxe and Theodore de Beze both regarded the revival of learning as a step forward in revealing the errors into which the

[42] *Ibid.*, 74.

[43] Fol. A7 verso.

[44] Fol. A2 verso.

[45] G. Arnold, *Unparteiische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie* (Frankfurt, 1700-1715) II, 647-48.

[46] Part II, fol. 183 verso.

[47] *Ibid.*, fol. 182 recto.

[48] Ernst Schäfer, *Luther als Kirchenhistoriker* (Gütersloh, 1897) 447.

[49] W. K. Ferguson, *The Renaissance in Historical Thought* (Cambridge, 1948) 53.

church had fallen. Foxe emphasized the invention of printing and the work of humanists, such as Petrarch, Valla, Pico, Reuchlin, Colet, Beatus Rhenanus, and Erasmus. Beze noted particularly the work of Reuchlin in recovering a knowledge of the Hebrew language.[50] Thus for orthodox Protestantism the renaissance prepared the way for a fuller restoration by Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

A number of Anabaptists credited Luther and Zwingli with the role which the Reformers assigned to the humanists. Only in the Anabaptists themselves, however, was the work of restitution complete.

This interpretation of the religious developments in the early part of the sixteenth century appeared quite early. We have already noted the anonymous tract, *Von der Genugthuung Christi,* in which the sixteenth century Reformers were identified as the two-horned beast of the Apocalypse which originally attacked the Roman system but now defended its error.[51] Hans Hut held a similar point of view. The new evangelicals overthrew the authority of popes, monks, and priests, but "Brother Soft-Life" has now gone whoring anew with the Babylonian knaves.[52] Nevertheless, God has recently begun to rebuild His broken church in all places.[53] A similar attitude was revealed by Melchior Rinck in a hearing in Hesse in August, 1528.[54]

Likewise, the Anabaptist representatives at the debate in Bern in 1538 agreed that Luther and Zwingli made a beginning in doing away with the Mass and papal ceremonies. This work was necessary and the Anabaptists were thankful for it. Nevertheless, the Anabaptists maintained that the work of Luther and Zwingli had borne no fruit in daily life. Therefore, God sent His messengers, Conrad Grebel and others, to set up the True Church on the apostolic pattern.[55]

The Hutterite chronicle dated the beginning of the restitution in 1517 with Luther's protest against indulgences. Two years later, Ulrich Zwingli of Zürich began to teach and write against the Babylonian abominations. Luther and Zwingli both revealed the knavery of the papacy. In spite of this good beginning they had not restored the church. For one thing, they divided into two camps as a result

[50] *Ibid.,* 55-57.

[51] "Concerning the Satisfaction of Christ." An Anabaptist Tract on True Christianity. M.Q.R. XX (1946) 243-54.

[52] L. Müller, *Glaubenszeugnisse Oberdeutscher Taufgesinnter* (Leipzig, 1938) 14.

[53] *Ibid.,* 12 n.

[54] W. Köhler *et al., Urkundliche Quellen zur Hessischen Reformationsgeschichte: Täuferakten* (Marburg, 1951) 4.

[55] *Acta Des gesprächs Inn der Statt Bern, 1538,* 35, 36.

of a quarrel over the interpretation of the Supper. Both of them retained the abominable infant baptism. Both of them attached themselves to worldly power and depended upon human help. They established their doctrine with the sword. Finally, they had not produced an improvement in daily life. Their highest service, according to Braitmichel, was to eat meat, to get married, and to rebuke the pope, the monks, and the priests. Braitmichel compared their work to that of a person who would mend an old kettle, but the hole became only worse. Nevertheless, Braitmichel gave credit to those who had died for the Lutheran faith. "We call them saved according to the teaching of Christ, since they endured and have fought a good fight."[56]

The true restitution began in Switzerland, where Grebel and Manz split with Zwingli on the question of infant baptism. Soon these two dissenters were joined by Georg Blaurock. The new visible church began with the baptism of Blaurock and Grebel.[57]

The Hutterite hymn writer Wolf Sailer also credited Luther and Zwingli with revealing the corruption of the papacy. Like other Anabaptists, Sailer charged the two Reformers with going over to the world. But the light had shone also in many places. Sailer did not describe the true restitution, but it is clear that he had Anabaptists in mind.[58]

Later revisions of Braitmichel's chronicle reveal some difficulty in giving the precise date of the true restitution. Ambrosy Resch, in his preface, states that he has discovered in the writings of devout brethren what has happened in the church of God since 1524.[59] At one point some manuscripts give two years, 1524 and 1526, "after the Peasants' War."[60] In most cases, however, the date was correctly given as 1525.[61]

Some Anabaptists were less specific about the circumstances under which the restitution had taken place, but all of them agreed that it was of recent origin. Balthasar Hubmaier wrote that until the present he and others had been only mouth Christians and paper Christians.[62] Denk thanked God that He had now awakened the world to seek the truth and that men are concerned about their er-

56 Wolkan, *Geschicht-Buch,* 31-33.

57 *Ibid.,* 34.

58 "Grosz wunder tut mich zwingen," *Lieder der Hutterischen Brüder,* 201 f.

59 J. Beck, *Die Geschichts-Bücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Vienna, 1883) 3.

60 Ibid., 10.

61 *Ibid.,* 12 ff.

62 Lewis and Davidson, *op. cit.,* 248.

rors.[63] In 1534, Kilian Aurbacher wrote to Bucer that the church was rebuilt in their own time.[64] At one point, Menno Simons stated that the movement and doctrine of the Holy Divine Word had been going on in Germany "for a number of years" and was still going on.[65] Menno explained that the reason he continued to write was that he wished to have a part, according to his talents, in rebuilding that which had been demolished, in repairing that which was damaged, and in restoring the church to Jesus Christ.[66]

Some Anabaptists apparently rejected the idea of predecessors in the work of restitution, at least in the area in which they were active. In 1529, Kautz denied that a true church existed in Strasbourg.[67] In 1557, Peter Loss was reported to have said that the truth had not yet been preached in Hesse.[68] Rembert has pointed out that Campanus conceived of himself as the first to have rediscovered the truth since the time of the apostles.[69]

For Servetus the time of the restitution was yet in the future. On the basis of Revelation 12:6 Servetus computed the restitution would take place 1260 years after the fall. If we take the date of the Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, as the date of the fall, then the restitution will come in 1585, almost a quarter of a century in the future. If we date the fall from the beginning of Constantine's reign, however, the remaining time of Antichrist would be reduced to about a decade. Yet Servetus believed that the battle which would end in the restitution had already begun and that he himself was working side by side with the angels toward this end.[70] Hence the restitution had already made a start, even though it was not yet fulfilled.

Melchior Hofmann, like Servetus, combined the restitution and eschatology. But Hofmann set a much nearer date, 1533.[71] Strasbourg was selected as the seat of the New Jerusalem from which the 144,000 apostles of the Lord shall go out to gather together the band of the elect, to call them to the Gospel, and to pledge and bind them to the Lord through baptism.[72]

63 L. Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer* (Leipzig, 1882), 183.

64 Karl Adam, *op cit.*, Part VI, 160f.

65 *Complete Works of Menno Simons*, I, 149.

66 *Ibid.*, II, 241, 243.

67 T. W. Röhrich, "Zur Geschichte der strassburgischen Wiedertäufer in den Jahren 1527 bis 1543. Aus den Vergichtbüchern und andern archivalischen Quellen," *Zeitschrift für historische Theologie*, XXX (1860) 47. Karl Adam, *op. cit.*, Part II, 126.

68 Köhler, *et al.*, *op. cit.*, 330.

69 *Op. cit.*, 211.

70 *Restitutio*, 627-628.

71 Zur Linden, *op. cit.*, 197.

72 Karl Adam, *op. cit.*, Part V, 239; Röhrich, *op. cit.*, 78-79; Martin Bucer, *Hand-*

Bernhard Rothmann agreed with the Swiss Brethren and the Hutterites that the work of restitution began with Luther, Zwingli, and Erasmus, who had recognized Antichrist and revealed his abominations. But when it came to naming those who had continued and completed the task, Rothmann overlooked completely the work of Grebel and his associates. Instead, he named Melchior Hofmann, Jan Matthys, and John of Leyden.[73] Münster, instead of Strasbourg, became the new Jerusalem, and the time was now.[74]

Although the radical fringe connected the restitution with the Day of the Lord more closely than did the main stream of Anabaptism by setting a definite date in the near future, Anabaptists in general believed that the restitution was a prelude to greater things to come.

lung inn dem offentlichen Gesprech zuo Strassburg, 1533, fol. Aiiij verso; *BRN,* V. 152; Rembert, *op. cit.,* 465.

[73] *Restitutio,* 16-17.

[74] *Ibid.,* 19, 40, 110.

A STUDY OF MENNONITE SOCIAL DISTANCE REACTIONS*

Lee Roy Just

Introduction

Small cultural groups, such as the Mennonites, provide excellent subject material for an intensive study of social distance attitudes. The Mennonites possess strong feelings of in-group loyalty fortified by distinctive cultural characteristics. The Mennonites, or Anabaptists as they are frequently called, originated in Europe during the time of the Reformation. They formed the extreme left wing of the reform movement and, as a result were persecuted by both Protestants and Catholics.

By 1683 Mennonites had migrated to America in search of freedom of religion. Others migrated to Prussia from the Low Countries, from there to the Russian Ukraine, and then to the Americas. Many of the migrations were instigated by losses of self-government and freedom from military service. To escape the "meddling world," the Mennonites have repeatedly migrated to new and undeveloped areas. Today, with few undeveloped areas to move to, the Mennonites are seeking an adjustment to "the world." This study was an attempt to determine and analyze the social distance attitudes of Mennonite young people, who have grown up in cultural islands resulting from self-imposed segregation and who are undergoing a critical adjustment to "the world" from which they have been taught to remain "separate."

The three Mennonite branches of this study ("Old" Mennonites, General Conference Mennonites, and Mennonite Brethren) stress the education of their young people, and, in order to control the content of the educational program, build and support educational systems of their own. Actually, this is a part of the practice of "separation," but it is also a positive attempt to retain and perpetuate cherished ideals and traditions. Essentially, the Mennonites

* The first part of an abstract of a Ph.D. dissertation in sociology at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles, 1952, "An Analysis of the Social Distance Reactions of Students from the Three Major American Mennonite Groups." For a more detailed analysis of methodology, problems associated with the measurement of attitudes, and particularly the social distance reactions of Mennonite secondary school and college students, see the dissertation. The first five paragraphs of this article appeared in the March-April 1954 *Sociology and Social Research.* The rest is taken from Chapter V of the dissertation. Dr. Just is Professor of Sociology, Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kansas.

are a simple, peace-loving group who believe they have a message for "the world" but find it rather difficult to "go into all the world" and yet remain "separated" from it.

The Concept of Social Distance. The concept of social distance is a valuable tool in the study and interpretation of man's social relations. Social distance, as it was used in this study, is of the personal-group type and refers to the amount of sympathetic understanding that exists between a person and a group. It also refers to the entire continuum from social nearness to social farness. When a person possesses an attitude of great social nearness, he is tolerant and has a great deal of sympathetic understanding for a particular group or groups. When his attitude is one of great social farness, he is intolerant, prejudiced, and characterized by a very small degree of sympathetic understanding.

The Data. Three social distance scales were prepared for this study, using the Bogardus pattern.[1] The first scale was designed to obtain social distance responses to thirty selected ethnic groups,[2] the second obtained responses to thirty-four selected non-Mennonite religious groups,[3] and the third obtained responses to twenty-six selected Mennonite groups.[4] A complete set of instructions was prepared and sent to the heads of sixteen Mennonite secondary schools and colleges in America. The scales were administered to 1,713 Mennonite students. From the completed scales it was possible to determine the average response made by each Mennonite school group to the individual ethnic, non-Mennonite religious, and Mennonite groups and to the ethnic, non-Mennonite religious, and Mennonite scales as a whole. Thus it became possible to arrange groups in each

[1] "Social Distance Test," second experimental edition, mimeographed, University of Southern California, 1951.

[2] These groups were Armenians, Americans (U.S. white), Canadians, Chinese, Czechs, English, Filipinos, Finns, French, Germans, Greeks, Hollanders, Indians (American), Indians (of India), Irish, Italians, Japanese, Japanese Americans, Jews, Koreans, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Negroes, Norwegians, Poles, Russian, Scots, Spaniards, Swedes, and Turks.

[3] The non-Mennonite religious groups were Adventists, Atheists, Baptists, Brahmans, Buddhists, Christian Scientists, Confucianists, Congregationalists, Disciples of Christ, Episcopalians, Friends (Quakers), Fundamentalists, Greek Catholics, Hinduists, Holy Rollers, Humanists, Jewish (Orthodox), Jewish (Reformed), Lutherans, Methodists, Modernists, Mormons, Parsees, Presbyterians, Reformed (Dutch), Roman Catholics, Salvation Army, Shintoists, Spiritualists, Theosophists, Unitarians, United Brethren, Universalists, Zoroastorists.

[4] The selected Mennonite groups were Amish Mennonite, Bergtaler Mennonite, Chortitz Mennonite, Church of God in Christ, Conservative Amish, Defenseless Mennonite, European Mennonite, Evangelical Mennonite Brethren, General Conference Mennonite, Hutterian Brethren, Immanuel Mennonite Brethren, Kleine Gemeinde, Krimmer Mennonite Brethren, Mennonite Brethren, Mennonite Brethren in Christ, Old Colony Mennonite, (Old) Mennonite, Old Order Amish, Old Order Mennonite, Reformed Mennonite, Rudnerweide Mennonite, Sommerfelder Mennonite, Sonnenberg Mennonite, Stauffer Mennonite, United Mennonite, Weavertown Amish.

scale according to rank order of preference. This was done in table form as well as by comparing the average responses to determine the significance of the observed differences.

Findings of the Study

The Three Major Mennonite Colleges. (Old) Mennonite students at Goshen College show significantly more social nearness toward the ninety selected groups on the three social distance scales than do General Conference Mennonite students at Bethel College or Mennonite Brethren students at Tabor College. The General Conference Mennonite students at Bethel show significantly more social nearness toward groups on the ethnic and religious scales than do Tabor Mennonite Brethren students. The difference between Bethel and Tabor responses to the Mennonite scale is insignificant. This is the first indication that the (Old) Mennonites, although they retain special dress regulations and emphasize "separation," are perhaps the most sympathetic of the three major Mennonite branches in their understanding of other peoples. The General Conference Mennonites are next in the amount of sympathetic understanding they portray, and the Mennonite Brethren are last.

The Three Major Mennonite Branches. By using the responses of all the college students in Mennonite colleges it was found that the (Old) Mennonite college students reveal significantly more tolerance toward ethnic groups than do General Conference Mennonite or Mennonite Brethren college students. The difference between (Old) Mennonite and General Conference Mennonite college students' responses toward the religious and Mennonite scales is insignificant, but the (Old) Mennonite college students reveal significantly more social nearness toward groups on the religious and Mennonite scales than do Mennonite Brethren college students. The General Conference Mennonite college students possess more sympathetic understanding toward the ninety selected groups on all three scales than do the Mennonite Brethren college students. In terms of significant differences, the (Old) Mennonite college students reveal the most tolerant attitudes, the General Conference Mennonites are next, and Mennonite Brethren college students reveal the most intolerant attitude.

The Comparison of Selected Factors. Conclusions concerning seven major hypotheses are given in the light of the data available in this study.

1. The first hypothesis: Mennonite secondary students show more social farness toward the ninety selected groups than Mennon-

ite college students. The findings of this paper conclusively show that the hypothesis is true. The difference in response to all three social distance scales is highly significant and not due to chance. Mennonite college students have more tolerant attitudes toward the ninety selected groups than do Mennonite high school students. It is impossible to determine from this study whether the observed differences are a result of the more tolerant high school students going to college, or whether the college experience fosters tolerant attitudes. Perhaps both are true to a certain extent. A study of Mennonite schools to determine the effect of the high school and college experience upon social distance attitudes would be helpful.

2. The second hypothesis: There is no difference in the social distance responses of Mennonite male and female students. According to the data of this study, the hypothesis is false. Mennonite male students, in their responses to the ethnic, religious, and Mennonite scales, reveal significantly less prejudice (social farness) than do female students. These results indicate that there must be something in the Mennonite culture which causes females to respond to the ninety selected groups with less tolerance than the males.

3. The third hypothesis: Rural Mennonite students reveal greater social farness than do the urban. In terms of responses made to the ethnic scale, the rural students do indicate less tolerance than the urban, but the observed difference is probably due to chance. The responses to the religious scale show significant differences, with the rural groups definitely revealing less tolerance. The difference in response to the Mennonite scale is very slight. The hypothesis is true, therefore, only in the case of the religious scale, but not so in the cases of the ethnic and Mennonite scales. Here is an example of the importance of the social situation. Whereas rural and urban Mennonite students reveal similar attitudes toward ethnic and Mennonite groups, a differentiated response is obtained when the religious factor is predominant. A possible reason for this may be that a large share of the social life of rural Mennonites takes place within the total church program and when social relations are measured within this context, a relatively intolerant attitude is displayed.

4. The fourth hypothesis: Mennonite students choosing "individual service" vocations show more social farness than those choosing "social service" and "religious service" vocations or professions. (The classification of vocations and professions appears in the first chapter.) The data of this study prove the above hypothesis to be true. There is no significant difference between the responses of "social service" and "religious service" students, but

there is a significant difference between these two groups and the "individual service" students. It cannot be said that the type of vocation or profession chosen by Mennonite students has greatly affected their social distance responses because very few have actually entered into their life's work. Rather, there is reason to believe that individuals with certain social attitudes tend to choose certain vocations and professions.

5. The fifth hypothesis: Mennonite students show most social farness to non-Mennonite religious groups, less to ethnic groups, and least to Mennonite groups. Information gathered for this study indicates that the above hypothesis is true. There is a definite tendency on the part of Mennonite students to respond with tolerance when a group's ethnic name is used and relative intolerance when their religious name is used.

6. The sixth hypothesis: To the extent that "separation from the world" is emphasized as a cardinal religious principle or doctrine, it tends to create attitudes of social farness toward those from whom one is to be "separated." Perhaps the (Old) Mennonites stress "separation" more than the Mennonite Brethren or General Conference Mennonites, with their dress regulations serving as an example. The data prove, however, that this emphasis of the (Old) Mennonites does not necessarily create attitudes of social farness toward others. It may be that the (Old) Mennonites have learned how to teach their young people to live a life of "separation" without creating attitudes of intolerance. At least, on the basis of this study, it cannot be said that the emphasis upon "separation" creates social farness. On the other hand, it may be that the Mennonite emphasis upon "separation" is largely theoretical and, as a result, has little effect upon social distance responses.

7. The seventh hypothesis: Mennonite college students reveal more social farness than do non-Mennonite college students. The comparison made possible by this paper shows that the hypothesis is definitely false. The average responses of Mennonite and non-Mennonite American young people are almost identical.

Other conclusions which may be drawn from this study are that great interest in foreign mission programs by the Mennonites does not insure attitudes of social nearness toward the "heathen." Greatest intolerance was shown by all three Mennonite groups toward the very peoples among whom they promote extensive mission programs. Rabindranath Tagore and Mohandas Gandhi have both spoken of the racial, ethnic, and religious pride with which Western missionaries come to India. The humility which these great Indians

have failed to see in Westerners, is a humility without which Mennonites cannot commend the Gospel.

Sociologists often hear that there are greater differences in intelligence or biological features within the white race than between the white race and the black. A similar truth is shown in this study concerning social distance responses. There are greater differences in social distance responses within the Mennonite groups as a whole than there are between Mennonites and the non-Mennonites in America.

Concerning the concept of social distance and its measurement, it may be concluded that it is a useful tool in the analysis of social distance attitudes of groups of people. It also provides a means by which groups may be compared in terms of their attitudes and feelings toward their own and other groups. Furthermore, it points out possible causes of social problems. There is nothing in this study to indicate that the use of the concept should be abandoned.

This research was another test of the usefulness of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. Several observations may be made which resulted from this test. In the first place, the scale is a very effective means of arranging a number of groups of people on a continuum from relative social nearness to farness. Second, these rank orders may easily be compared one with another and similarities and differences noted.

It was found in this study that there was a rather general complaint from those who administered the scales that the students had not heard of many of the groups listed. This resulted in a tendency to omit responses to the unknown groups and thus weaken the response to the scale as a whole. When this occurred, it sometimes became impractical to compute a particular student's average quotient for the scales.

There may be an advantage in having a scale which allowed for more than seven social relationships to choose from. A difference in average quotients of 2.10 and 2.35 may be significant if the samples are large enough and the standard deviation is not too great. Both of these quotients indicate that the groups concerned would be accepted, on the average, as close friends, but in slightly varying degrees. If finer or smaller units of measurement could be used on the social distance continuum, then the small but significant differences would take on added meaning in terms of the verbal description of the attitude. For example, the "Would have as a close friend" column may be differentiated by the use of four statements such as, "Would have as very close friends," "Would have as close

friends," "Would have as friends," and "Would have as casual friends."

In the same manner, it is difficult to distinguish between the varying degrees of "Would work beside in an office," and "Would have as next-door neighbors." The former may imply a rather impersonal relationship and the latter a personal or "neighborly" relationship, in which case the two should be reversed in terms of their present position on the social distance continuum. More specific and detailed points on the social distance continuum would aid in the understanding of small but significant differences.

The above-mentioned shortcomings may not be serious, and are stated here only as a part of the analysis of the usefulness of the social distance scale. Future modifications of the scale could be made with these points in mind.

Suggestions for Further Research

A study such as this usually raises questions which, in itself, it cannot answer. This section, therefore, is intended to point out areas of research which need attention to further clarify the problem of analyzing social distance reactions of Mennonites.

The Problem of Defining Social Conservatism and Liberalism. This study points out the inadequacy of present definitions of conservatism and liberalism now in use among the Mennonites. These social concepts have been based upon general observation, any special emphasis the group may have, amount of fraternization with other groups, church practice, and the folkways and mores. As a result, the General Conference Mennonites are often considered as the most liberal of the three branches in this study. In terms of social distance attitudes, however, the (Old) Mennonites prove to be the most liberal or socially minded.

In this connection, further research is necessary to determine the cause of either social nearness or farness. One thing this paper reveals is that an emphasis upon "separation from the world" does not necessarily produce attitudes of social farness. Furthermore, an outward semblance of tolerance does not necessarily presuppose attitudes of social nearness.

The Test of Actual Behavior. It would be worth while to analyze the social attitudes of the three major Mennonite branches through a study of actual behavior. To what extent do the three branches of Mennonites in this paper co-operate with other groups in the community? To what extent are they aware of race problems, industrial problems, and religious conflict, and to what extent

do they promote programs and conferences which deal with intergroup relations? To what degree does each group exhibit an attitude of isolation in its program of religious activities? These and similar questions leave much to be desired in the area of research which deals with observable behavior patterns. The test of actual behavior would be very helpful in determining the effectiveness of the concept of "separation."

The Attitude of the Parents. Inasmuch as a significant difference was found to exist between the social distance responses of secondary and college students, it is desirable to know what the attitude of the adult church member is. If the scales employed in this study were to be administered in the churches to the adult population, further comparisons could be made. This effort would be particularly useful in determining whether the adult church members are most like the high school or college students in their responses.

A Definition of the School and Church Programs. Another suggestion for further research is in the area of determining what the Mennonite churches and schools hold as desirable social attitudes. Are the churches and schools agreed as to the most desirable attitudes they wish to foster? Do the church and school foster attitudes of social farness or nearness towards, for example, the ninety selected groups in this study? When church members hold attitudes of social farness toward members of non-Mennonite groups, does this hinder the effectiveness of the church program? Do attitudes of social farness hinder the achievement of group goals? What attitudes are desirable for a prospective missionary to have toward those to whom he feels called to minister? Would it be advisable to make his social attitudes a criterion for his acceptance or rejection as a candidate? How may prejudice be reduced in the Mennonite church and school program? These questions present other problems for research.

Trends of Change in Social Attitudes. If studies similar to this were made in the schools of the three major Mennonite branches every five years, it would be possible to establish the direction of any possible change in the attitudes of Mennonite youth. Theoretically, the student bodies of every school would have been replaced every five years. There is also the possibility of following high school freshmen on through college to note what changes, if any, take place in the development of an individual's attitudes. The problem of causation may also be studied in relation to the above suggestions.

It is hoped that future students in sociology, psychology, and social psychology will add to this study.

PETER RIDEMAN AND MENNO SIMONS ON ECONOMICS

Donald Sommer*

The Anabaptists differed from the other Reformation groups in that they believed the church should be a voluntary body of believers, rather than a large universal organization designed to cover the whole life of humanity. This fundamental difference was the basis for a new approach on the part of the Anabaptists to the problem of social and economic organization.

In the first place, Anabaptists based their economic and social teachings not upon natural law, but on the plain teachings of Christ and the example of the early church. This is evident in the writings of Rideman and Menno, who substantiate every major point by reference to the Scriptures, especially the New Testament. The early Christian church is viewed as the example which the church should follow in all things, including social and economic practices. Because the Anabaptists believed that each individual member of the church should have a personal experience of salvation they had as members of their brotherhood only those who confessed their faith and belief in Christ. A control of membership was maintained by the use of excommunication.

The community of believers, they taught, should be nonconformed to and separated from the world. They were convinced that it was impossible to carry out the law of Christ in secular society because of the earthly rule of sin. Accordingly they formed communities which were largely independent and isolated from the rest of society, and did not attempt to impress their practices upon society at large. Instead they lived exemplary Christian lives in communities which were as nearly as possible freed from the influences of the secular world.

Nor did the Anabaptists believe in using the civil government in any way to help achieve their ends, as the state churches did. Rather, though recognizing the government as a necessity ordained in the Scriptures, they refused to participate in government affairs. They detached themselves from secular society as much as possible and lived peaceably alongside of the "world." Between the Christian community and the secular world they saw an absolute, not a relative, difference.

* Donald Sommer is engaged in business in Kidron, Ohio. This paper is part of a senior Social Science Seminar done at Goshen College in 1951-52.

Therefore the social and economic teachings of the Anabaptists applied strictly to Christians, and made no concessions to the prevailing social order. The principles were set down for a community of believers, in which the governing factor of social relationships was Christian love, not law. Economic practice was guided by the principle of love, and "brotherhood" was the way of life, in which material things were shared, the extremes of poverty and wealth being avoided.

Peter Rideman (1506-56), a leader of the Hutterian Brethren wing of Anabaptism and author of the *Rechenschaft,* their confession of faith, believed that true brotherhood was possible only when Christians lived in a community which had all things in common, material as well as spiritual. He believed Christian fellowship could be had only when none of those participating had any material things for themselves. "Thus all those who have fellowship," he says, "likewise have nothing for themselves, but have all things with their Master and with all those who have fellowship with them, that they might be one in the Son as the Son is in the Father."[1]

Rideman based this community of goods first of all on the promise of God, that He will give all things to those that believe in Him. Rideman believed the fulfillment of this promise came about when a person became a member of the community of Christ. He taught that when the believer joined the community in which both material and spiritual blessings were had in common, through those who fellowshiped with him, the promise of God was fulfilled in the strictest sense of the word.

Another reason that Rideman gives for the Hutterite belief in community of goods is that none of God's gifts were given to one man alone, but were given to the entire fellowship. He pointed out that fellowship itself was a communion of all believers with one common God. The gift of Christ, also, was for all men. I Corinthians 12:12-27, Rideman believed, shows how all members of the body of Christ should have nothing for themselves, but everything for the rest of the members. So it follows, Rideman taught, that none of God's gifts are for one member's sake, but for the whole body with all its members.[2]

So it was clear that the communion of saints must be not only in spiritual things, but also in the material. The reason he saw for this was to bring about the equality among the brethren neces-

[1] Peter Rideman, *Account of Our Religion, Doctrine and Faith, Given by Peter Rideman of the Brothers Whom Men Call Hutterians.* (Suffolk, 1950), 43.
[2] *Ibid.,* 43.

sary for fellowship. Concerning this, Rideman quoted Paul: "(that) one might not have abundance and another suffer want, but that there might be equality." He also refers to the law of God concerning the manna in the wilderness: "That he who gathered little had not less, and he who gathered much had nothing over, since each was given what he needed according to the measure."[3] So the necessity for economic equality for true fellowship was to Rideman a clear fact; the only way to achieve this equality was through the practice of a Christian communism.

His next argument for community of goods was that it could clearly be seen in all creation that no man was to have anything privately, but all men were to have all things in common. The sun, stars, day and night, "and such like" were to Rideman examples of those things which are still in their original state of being common to all men. He believed that it was because of original sin, since man took what he should not have taken and made it his property, that he has become hardened to having private property. Rideman believed that this sin had progressed so far that man had almost forgotten his Creator, and hungered for created things. This great sin was to him a challenge for true Christians to practice community of goods.[4]

Rideman's next point in his defense of Christian communism is that when a man dies, he must leave on this earth all material things. It was for this reason, he believed, that Christ had called all temporal things foreign to man's essential nature when He said, "If ye are not faithful in what is not your own, who will entrust to you what is your own?"[5] Thus Rideman believed that it was because the material was foreign to man's true nature and did not belong to him, that the law commanded that no one should covet strange possessions. He interpreted the commandment "Thou shalt not covet" as meaning that we should not attach ourselves to the material, which is in reality alien to us. So, he said, all Christians must forsake taking to themselves any private property. He pointed to the words of Christ: "Whosoever forsaketh not all that he hath cannot be my disciple." His conclusion, then, was that if a person is to be renewed into the likeness of God, it is essential for him to give up grasping to himself material things.[6]

Following this same reasoning, Rideman added that only the person who freed himself from material things could grasp the true

[3] *Ibid.*, 88.
[4] *Ibid.*, 89.
[5] *Ibid.*, 89 (Luke 16:9-13).
[6] *Ibid.*, 89.

and divine. When a person did get hold of the truth, Rideman believed, he would naturally empty himself of the material by regarding no possession as his own, but as belonging to all God's children. So, he said, it was essential to practice community in material things. Never could any Christian covet possessions, but one was to free himself from the material to show himself to be of the likeness of God.[7]

Now comes the climax. For all these reasons, Rideman wrote, the Holy Spirit at the beginning of the Christian Church began again a community of goods. He believed that this should still be the example for the church, for Paul said, "Let none seek his own profit, but the profit of another" (Phil. 2:2-4), or, as Rideman reworded it, "Let none seek what benefiteth himself, but what benefiteth many." Further evidence is cited from Philippians 2:2-11 and Romans 14:7-18, where Rideman believed that Paul was urging the Christians to practice community of goods. Proof that the early Christians had obeyed this exhortation, Rideman believed was in this quotation from I Corinthians 8:1-5: "I tell you of the grace that is given to the churches in Macedonia . . . . For I bear witness that with all their power, and beyond their power, they were themselves willing . . . to receive and benefit the community of hope which is given to the saints. . . ."[8] So Rideman believed that all Christians should follow this example and practice community of goods.

Though Rideman's discussion of community is based on the Scriptures and the example of the early church, his interpretation is at places open to questioning. He apparently overlooked the fact that the early church practiced only a common consumption and not co-operative production. Thus the example of the early church was not the precedent for the Hutterite practices that Rideman claimed it to be. The validity of several of his other arguments is obviously doubtful. Yet his discussion reveals to us clearly and concisely the basis for the Hutterite practice of Christian communism, namely that the brethren must be equal in material as well as spiritual things in order to have fellowship.

The Dutch Anabaptists also believed that economic equality was a necessary part of fellowship. They did not, however, believe that brotherhood included the practice of community of goods. Menno Simons shows this in his reply to an accuser who charged that the followers of Menno had their property in common, saying

[7] *Ibid.*, 90.
[8] *Ibid.*, 91.

that this charge was absolutely false and without basis. The Dutch Anabaptists' belief, he states, was that although the apostolic churches in the beginning practiced "community," yet in the Epistles the practice is said to have passed out of existence. Probably for a good reason, Menno adds, not saying what this good reason might have been. He continues that since it was not continually practiced by the apostles, the Dutch Anabaptists also never taught or practiced the community of goods.[9] He makes a similar statement when he writes concerning the errors of Münster, referring to the practice as a theft, which seems to have been the popular conception of this practice of Münster.[10] He says here again that the brethren did not teach or permit such a practice, and that they firmly believed that theft is expressly forbidden in the Scriptures. He affirms that none of the brothers took and possessed the land or property of another, as many were falsely accusing them of doing.[11] Whenever Menno wrote concerning the community of goods, he at once described the type of community, based on Christian mutual aid, in which the group believed. In this type of community, sharing of material goods with those in need was motivated by love. As a result of this extensive sharing, all members were to be on a similar economic level. It was a community founded in the harmony and unity that only a truly Christian group can have.

Menno writes concerning community, "We teach and maintain . . . that all truly believing Christians are members of one body and are baptized by one Spirit into one body. . . .

"Inasmuch as they are thus one, therefore it is Christian and reasonable . . . that the one member be solicitous for the welfare of the other. . . . The Scriptures speak of mercifulness and love; and it is a sign whereby a true Christian may be known. . . .

"It is not customary that an intelligent person clothes and cares for one part of his body and leaves the rest destitute and naked. No, the intelligent person is solicitous for all his members. Thus it should be with those who are the Lord's church and body. All those who are born of God . . . are called into one body of love in Christ Jesus, (and) are prepared by such love to serve their neighbors with money and goods. They show mercy and love as much as they

[9] *The Complete Works of Menno Simon.* (Elkhart, 1871), II, 310.

[10] The enemies of the Anabaptists were spreading the propaganda that having goods in common was the practice of all Anabaptists. To make the accusation stronger they referred to the practice as a theft, intimating that the Anabaptists used force to take away the goods of any members of their community who would not co-operate. Menno answers this charge in the statement referred to here.

[11] *Ibid.*, I, 83.

can; suffer no beggars among them; take to heart the need of the saints, receive the miserable, take the stranger into their houses, console the afflicted, assist the needy, clothe the naked, feed the hungry, do not turn their face from the poor and do not despise their own flesh. . . . Such a community we teach."[12]

The similarity of results coming from this type of Christian sharing and the compulsory sharing practiced by the Hutterites is evident. Both groups taught that Christians should have a deep concern for their brethren in material as well as spiritual matters, and believed that Brotherhood rested on an economic as well as a social and spiritual basis.

The care of the needy is an important aspect of the community of love as practiced by the Anabaptists. Menno discussed various factors in the care of the poor in his writings. He says, in the first place, that the care of those in need is an important part of the Christian life, the prime example of that loving and merciful quality which should be found in all saints. It belongs to and agrees with the tone of the Gospel of the Lord, and follows the example of Christ and the apostles. To Menno charity is the core of Christian love.[13]

But, as he also points out, giving to the poor does not in itself give proof of true regeneration, unless done in the proper spirit. It can also be done in hypocrisy, as many people exemplify. He is convinced that the alms of which many boast are not true charity. They are not the two mites taken from the widow's necessities, but are only crumbs of their abundance. He adds that if people would give to the support of the poor "all their silk, and the superabundance of clothes, . . . their ornaments, . . . gold, rings, chains, besides the booty of the persecuted, . . . then much of the suffering of the poor would be done away with."[14] It was not a charity which comes from people on a higher plane who stoop to give a handful of goods to those below them. It was instead the sharing of a true Christian, one which makes equal.

Another important aspect of the community of love was opposition to living on a high economic level. Menno was opposed to riches for several reasons. He believed, in the first place, that the

[12] It can readily be seen that Menno as well as Rideman based his teachings on the Word of God. His many references to the Scriptures is one indication of this. Following this statement, he listed the following passages as the basis for his belief: Deuteronomy 15:7; Tobit 4:16; Luke 6:36; Matthew 3:7; Colossians 3:12; James 2:13; Matthew 18:33; 25:36; Isaiah 58:7, 8; Romans 12:13.

[13] *Ibid.*, II, 309.

[14] *Ibid.*, II, 27.

Scriptures taught that to live in luxury and to be rich was wrong in itself. He cites the words of Jesus concerning the improbability of a rich man's entering the kingdom, and quotes James: "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you . . . ." And he points to the words of Paul: "For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called."[15] These teachings in themselves were to him enough reason why men should not attempt to become rich. However, he also points to his experience with the wealthy, saying that they were proud, ambitious, covetous, and seeking self-glory. These characteristics, he says, are not those of a Christian.

Then, too, those that are rich do not follow the example of Christ. Menno asks the rich what display of ease and comfort Christ made while He was on earth. The lowly life that He lived is clearly shown in the Scriptures. Was all this so that Christians should not live a comfortable, pleasurable life? Menno asks. Instead, all Christians should live lowly lives, not in riches, as Christ did.[16]

The final reason Menno gives for a Christian not to live in riches was that it broke the fellowship. Menno believed that it was hypocrisy to be a member of the Christian Church and to live in wealth while any of the brethren were in need, that it was impossible to have Christian fellowship when there was this discrepancy of economic level within the church. The Scriptures plainly teach, he said, that "whoso hath this world's good, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him?"[17]

How strongly the brethren believed in this is shown by Menno in his writings. "Sooner far would [the brethren], for the sake of the truth of the Lord, be bound hand and foot, and dragged before lords and princes than to see [any of their number] marry rich persons. . . . Sooner far would they see them scourged from head to feet, for the sake of the glory . . . of the Lord, than to see them adorn themselves with silks, velvets, gold, silver, costly . . . clothes, and the like vanity, pomp, and haughtiness."[18]

In this way the Dutch Anabaptists achieved the sense of brotherhood which the Hutterites received from having their goods in

[15] *Ibid.*, II, 17.
[16] *Ibid.*, II, 305.
[17] *Ibid.*, II, 310.
[18] *Ibid.*, I, 151.

common. The Dutch, however, carried the meaning of Christian charity one step further. They believed that it was a Christian responsibility to alleviate the need of the poor and suffering of the world, as well as within the church. Even in their poverty they helped those who were in need, as is shown by this illustration from Menno's writings: "In the year 1553, a little before midwinter, it happened that it was told the brethren that a shipload of people had arrived from Denmark, who on account of their faith were driven from England, and that they lay a short distance from the shore, frozen up on the ice.

"When the brethren heard of this, they were moved by Christian mercy on their account, as was proper. They counseled together, and concluded to lend them their assistance to help them out of the ice and properly escort them to the city. . . .

"They met them with wheat bread and wine, so that if there should be any sick among them, they might refresh and stimulate them therewith. And after they had escorted them into the city they made a collection of twenty-four talers out of their poverty and presented that sum to the leading ones of them, to be distributed among the needy if such there should be among them. They refused the money, and said they had enough; but would like that labor might be procured for some of their number, in which our brethren assisted them as much as they could."[19]

This practice of giving aid meant that at times they would assist people who would later persecute them, as happened in the case just mentioned. It also involved helping members of the world violently opposed to the Anabaptists and their principles. Under the conditions of poverty in which all Anabaptists were living at the time, every contribution to charity meant a sacrifice which the giver would suffer out of love. This was the Anabaptist conception of sharing which made possible true Christian brotherhood.

We have seen the interpretation of both the Hutterites and Anabaptists as to how a Christian community should maintain an equality of economic level. Although their methods differed, the spirit in which both groups practiced this brotherhood was the same. Both believed that true Christian charity involved dedicating all of one's goods to the Lord and to the service of others. The Hutterites believed this in the strictest sense of the word and practiced community of goods. The Dutch Anabaptist teaching was that there was no room for either the extremely wealthy or the poor in

[19] *Ibid.*, II, 355.

the brotherhood. Through Christian sharing, earthly goods were distributed throughout the community of believers, eliminating the extremes of wealth or poverty. All were on a similar economic level. These are economic principles which Christians today could well follow more closely.

Although the teachings concerning brotherhood were the basic and most important economic principles of the early Anabaptists, other principles were also included in the writings of Menno Simons and Peter Rideman. Those which guided the Christian businessman, and contained the Anabaptist concept of a proper economic system will be considered next.

Both Menno and Rideman held to a conservative economic system based on agriculture, as opposed to a commercial economic system as we have today. Rideman believed that only agriculture and those crafts necessary to maintain a household were legitimate occupations for Christians. Menno was only slightly more liberal, admitting that in some few cases a merchant or trader might have been doing a good work. He was quick to add, however, that trading was extremely dangerous, and even a Christian could hardly keep from doing wrong if engaged in such an occupation. Both of these views are far more conservative than that of Calvin, who, to a limited extent, accepted the legitimacy of commerce and finance.

One can readily understand why Rideman and Menno would favor an extremely conservative economic system. They were writing for a brotherhood of true Christians, whose business, instead of storing up material goods, was to maintain and spread the true Gospel of Christ; hence the simplest economic system would appeal to them as the best. Certainly to them the complexity of commerce and finance would have demanded attention and time which were in their opinion not warranted in the Christian life. The material to them was always to be in every way secondary. They believed that Christians could not spend their lives caring for things of this world to the extent that a commercial occupation would involve.

The attitude of Menno and Rideman toward the practice of usury clearly points out their conservative view of economic relations. We remember that Luther discussed the various "shades" of interest. Though he was opposed to the practice, he would hedge when actually asked whether it was wrong, by saying that the individual must decide on the basis of his conscience. Calvin frankly admitted that he could see nothing wrong with some types of taking

interest. Under the demands of growing commerce, even the Catholics were at this time making concessions to the necessity of capital and loans. In contrast to these views, Menno and Rideman did not even discuss the possibility of the practice of the Christian charging interest. They flatly denied that it could be practiced in any form or under any conditions.

Menno Simons, in his typical way, was outspoken against the practice of usury. At one place he wrote: "the whole world is so contaminated and involved in this accursed . . . finance, usury, and self-interest that I scarcely know how it could be worse."[20] At a number of other places in his writings, he mentioned the sin of usury as one of the chief troubles of his time. He included as among those who "live openly in sin, . . . all financiers and bankers, all who love money."[21] Never did he give any opportunity for the Christian to have finance as his occupation.

The practice of usury was so far from the thinking of Rideman that he did not even mention the practice in his writings. No doubt this is because there was no opportunity for lending in the community of goods, and so no necessity for taking what we today call interest.

Another indication of the belief of Rideman and Menno in a conservative economic system is their attitude toward the occupations of merchant or trader. Rideman thought it unchristian to be occupied in any such business, as is shown by the following quotation: "We allow none of our number to do the work of a trader or merchant, since this is a sinful business; as the wise man saith, 'It is almost impossible for a merchant and trader to keep himself from sin. And as a nail sticketh fast between door and hinge; so doth sin stick close between buying and selling.' Therefore do we allow no one to buy to sell again, as merchants and traders do. But to buy what is necessary for the needs of one's house or craft, to use it and then to sell what one by the means of his craft hath made therefrom, we consider to be right and not wrong.

"This only we regard as wrong: when one buyeth a ware and selleth the same again even as he bought it, taking to himself profit, making the ware dearer thereby for the poor, taking bread from their very mouths, and thus making the poor man nothing but the bondman of the rich. . . . They [the traders] say, however, 'But the poor also profit in that one bringeth goods from one hand to another!' There they use poverty as a pretext, seeking all the time

[20] *Ibid.*, I, 138.
[21] *Ibid.*, I, 136.

their own profit first, and thinking only of the poor as having an occasional penny in their purse. Therefore we permit this not amongst us, but say with Paul that they should labor working with their hands what is honest, that they may have to give to him that needeth."[22]

Rideman was entirely opposed to the growing capitalism of the time, and believed that only agriculture and the crafts were worthy occupations for Christians.

Menno's opinion concerning the propriety of commerce in the economic system was almost exactly the same as Rideman's. He wrote concerning the "unrighteous merchants and grocers" who were "so bent upon accursed gain that they exclude God from their hearts. They censure what they should properly praise, and praise what they should censure. . . . They sell, lend and trust the needy at exorbitant gain and usury." He then quoted the same passage from Ecclesiasticus (the apocryphal *Book of Wisdom*) that Rideman quoted in his denouncement of trading (see above), and warned that merchants had better take this doctrine more seriously. He did make some concession to the possibility of a Christian being a merchant by adding that he was speaking only to the unrighteous merchants, not to those who were righteous and pious. Yet he was also certain that the truly Christian must have been few in this "usurious and dangerous trade," and even these few were in danger of being overcome by avarice.[23]

So we see that both these sixteenth-century Anabaptists believed that the Christian should not allow himself to be contaminated by the evils of a commercial society, and that the way to avoid this contamination was by refusing to participate in trading, financing, or merchandising. Christians were, instead, to live the life of farmers or craftsmen, avoiding the worldly life of commercial circles.

Not only did Menno Simons teach against Christians participating in commercial activity, but he also believed that the greed of men involved in this commerce was one of the basic ills of the social system. He repeatedly taught that this avaricious attitude of men was a major cause of the prevalence of sin. Continually he warned against the selfish desire for gain that was evident in the world, nearly always listing avarice among the worst sins of his time, putting it on a plane with drunkenness and murder. The sinfulness of man in general, he thought, had its roots in greed for worldly

22 Rideman, *op. cit.*, 126.
23 Menno Simons, *op cit.*, I, 137.

possessions. The fact that the rise of commerce and capitalism seemed to increase this greed made Menno all the more certain that only evil could come from a capitalistic economic system.

It is clear then, that the sixteenth-century Anabaptists not only taught the avoidance by Christians of a life spent in commerce, but consistently attacked the growth of trade and capitalism of their time. They believed in a simplicity of economic dealings which would be less likely to detract from spiritual things. The complex economic relations of a person involved in commerce were not thought of as being conducive to a Christian life. They preached the desirability of an economy based on agriculture and the crafts, with a minimum of trading.

Besides teaching against participation in commerce, Rideman and Menno included in their writings other principles to guide Christians in their business life. Rideman especially emphasized the inconsistency of engaging in a business which involved practices contrary to the conscience of the Christian, such as making implements of war, elaborate clothing, or serving of alcoholic beverages. Concerning making tools for war he said: "Christians should beat their swords into ploughshares and take up arms no more—still less can they make the same, for they serve for naught else than to slay, harm and destroy men. . . . Therefore we make neither swords, spears, muskets, nor any such weapons. What, however, is made for the benefit and daily use of men, such as bread knives, axes, hoes, and the like, we both can and do make . . . for they are not made for the purpose of slaying and harming. . . . If they should ever be used to harm another, we do not share the harmer's guilt."[24]

In the same way Rideman opposed the making of clothes which have "elaborate braiding, floral and embroidery work," because such things only served a person's pride.[25] He also taught that none of their number were to work as a public innkeeper, since the activities in such a place were not wholesome. The brethren were, he said, instead to entertain all strangers in their homes, not for money, but out of love. These three examples point up a principle in a Christian choice of occupation that is obvious enough to make comment unnecessary.

Related to these men's teachings on business principles are their views regarding taxation. Here, again, Menno and Rideman had slightly varying views. Menno believed that Christians should pay all taxes imposed by the government, regardless of the type or

[24] Rideman, *op cit.*, 3.
[25] *Ibid.*, 112.

use of the taxes. Rideman, on the other hand, differentiated among taxes, and taught that it was not right for Christians to pay certain types of taxes, e.g., those levied for the special purpose of going to war, massacring, or shedding of blood. In fact, if a ruler exceeded the limits of his office as ordained of the Lord (to punish the wicked evildoers as part of God's vengeance), then Rideman believed the Christian should not pay taxes to support him. He warned that Christians were not to submit to every whim of a ruler. "That this is true is shown by the words of Paul . . . when he saith, 'Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due.' He doth not say 'Render whatsoever and however much they want,' but, 'Render their dues.' "

Rideman then explained that this meant that the only taxes which should be paid by Christians were the annual taxes of a stipulated amount. "For Christ (when saying, 'Render to Caesar . . .') was speaking of the yearly taxation, which was first imposed when Augustus was emperor and then continued and at this time there was neither war nor rumors of war. Therefore money was neither gathered nor given for this purpose. It was rather as if the count were now to put a tax on the wood on his land; for example, that whosoever taketh wood away in a cart should pay one gulden a year; whosoever taketh it away in a barrow half a gulden, and whosoever carrieth it home himself a quarter gulden. It was of such taxation that the Lord spoke when He said one should not refuse to pay, but give willingly; He spoke not of taxation for the shedding of blood. For this reason we also have no objection, but willingly pay such. Where, however, our conscience is violated, there we both must and desire to obey God rather than men."[26] In this matter the Hutterites took a firmer stand than the Dutch, who according to Menno, paid all taxes levied by the government.

Also related to the topic of business relations is the labor problem. Rideman lived in a society which had virtually no laborer-employer relations. There were no masters and servants because all men worked together in common labor. He, then, had nothing to say on this subject. Menno also had little concern about labor relations because most of the Dutch Brethren were self-employed, without servants. Only at one place in all his writings did Menno mention employer-employee relations. He stated here that masters should treat their servants kindly, teaching, admonishing and reproving them with a paternal spirit when they made a mistake.

[26] *Ibid.*, 110, 111.

Further, he said, the master was always to remember that he was an example to those who worked for him, and therefore was to live a righteous and pious life. The employer was to always remember the severe labor endured by servants, and was never to grieve them, but was always to give them their necessities and earned hire. If any servant ever became obstinate, wasting his time in idleness, Menno advised that the master should bring the matter before two or three witnesses. After this procedure, if it produced no results, the servant's wages were to be curtailed.[27] Menno also made it clear that no Christian should ever be one of these unworthy servants. He believed that any lazy person was to be excommunicated from the church and shunned. These principles guiding labor relations are clearly based on New Testament principles, and are guides to which Anabaptists still generally hold.

Menno Simons discussed another topic which, though it has little significance for this paper, is an interesting side light on his discussion of business relations. This is his statement concerning trade with the banned apostates. The question, as Menno stated it, was this: "Are we allowed to sell to, and buy of the apostates, inasmuch as Paul says that we should not have intercourse with them; and yet the disciples bought victuals in Sychar, and the Jews dealt with the Gentiles?" His answer was that because intercourse with apostates had been definitely condemned in the Scripture, no Christian was to have an apostate as a regular buyer and seller, though sometimes a Christian had to buy from an apostate. But he believed that it was not proper for any of the brethren to deal regularly with one who was being shunned.[28]

Another area of economic life which Menno and Rideman discussed, along with the principles of brotherhood and business ethics, was that dealing with the attitude of a Christian toward material things. Both these men spoke strongly about the impossibility of a Christian's considering earthly goods of much importance. Materialism to them was the antithesis of Christianity.

Both Menno and Rideman believed that Christians should view material goods as in themselves neither good nor evil. Menno taught that they were gifts of God, and that Christians should use them in a proper way, to praise God, and in service of fellow men.[29] Rideman, too, believed that all material things had been made for good to the believers, and should tend to lead men to God rather

[27] Menno Simons, *op. cit.*, I, 135.
[28] *Ibid.*, II, 279.
[29] *Ibid.*, I, 71.

than away from Him. Material things, he said, were only inert, neutral things. It was the perverse nature of the wicked which changed them into instruments of evil, or the proper stewardship by Christians which made them good.

Rideman believed that Christians, though they viewed the stewardship of temporal things as a means of doing good, had to be willing at any time to give up all their possessions for the glory of God. It was God who had given them, he reminded the Hutterites, and for His sake they were again to be given up. Rideman warned that whoever thought more of possessions, gold, silver, houses, or clothes than Christ, was not a Christian. Such a person was an idolater who raised his possessions above God, and broke the commandments.

Rideman believed that this Christian view of material things made it wrong for a believer to resort to law to gain his ends. No Christian should care enough for material things to quarrel over them in the first place, much less to take the matter to court. Christ also had taught, he added, that Christians had no time to argue in or out of court concerning material things.[30]

Thus the early Anabaptists reminded themselves that the pleasures of this earth were incomparable to those of the kingdom, and placed the desire for material wealth in subjugation, caring for nothing but the necessities of life. They made a sincere attempt to put material things on a proper level of importance in their lives.

Sixteenth-century Anabaptists believed that a part of the Christian attitude toward the material was a trust in God for the necessities of life. The Hutterites, of course, related this trust to their belief in community of goods. Rideman taught that this trust was fulfilled when a Christian entered the brotherhood. Earthly goods were then provided by God, through the brethren, to individual Christians, so that the promise of God was at all times being carried out to each believer.

Menno, of course, had a different interpretation of trust in God for material necessities. He believed that this trust was a test of faith. "If you believe," he wrote, "that the strong and mighty God, who nourished Israel forty years . . . and kept their clothes from being worn out . . . will provide for you by His grace, this is true evidence that you have the Word of the Lord."[31]

He believed that all Christians should have sufficient faith so that things of this world such as housing, clothes, and food would

[30] Rideman, *op. cit.*, 113.
[31] Menno Simons, *op. cit.*, I, 157.

not trouble them. Christ had richly promised, he pointed out, that all Christians would receive the necessities of food, clothing, and shelter. As proof, he quoted from the Psalms: "I have been young, and now I am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." If Christians would only have the faith expressed in this passage, he added, they would be concerned much less with things of this earth than they were.

Menno, of course, included ministers among those who must serve Christ, trusting in Him for material things. Menno did not believe that this meant, however, that ministers were to receive a regular salary as support from their congregations. He saw too many dangers in a practice of this type. In the first place he believed that this practice fostered an attitude in ministers of serving for material rather than spiritual gain. It tended to make hirelings of them instead of shepherds, as he put it, or at best they were a type a shepherds who were seeking wool, flesh, and milk instead of caring for the Lord's sheep. He pointed out that most salaried ministers gladly moved from one place to another for a better house or higher salary, and forgot that all souls were bought with the same price. Menno saw this growing desire for material wealth as one of the outstanding dangers of a salaried ministry.

Then, too, he believed that a minister who lived on a salary was not in a position to properly admonish those who were paying his wages. His opinion was that it would have been especially difficult for a minister to teach against sinful economic practices to those members who used their improperly gained money to support him; the preacher might tune his teaching to the members' wishes rather than to the true word.[32]

Still, Menno did believe that Christ had promised to provide for those who served Him. Menno considered the example of the apostles as the proper guide for ministers concerning their material support. These apostles did not receive regular salaries, he pointed out, but instead earned the greater part of their livelihood by their own labor. The necessities they could not earn in this way God provided through the assistance of the brethren who gave as God led them. He admonished ministers to "learn a trade, if possible, do manual labor, as did Paul, and all that which you then fall short of, will doubtlessly be given and provided you by the pious brethren by the grace of God. Understand it not as superfluously, but as necessarily."[33]

[32] *Ibid.*, II, 342.
[33] *Ibid.*, II, 348.

In connection with this teaching, Menno criticized severely the materialistic attitude of the clergy in the state churches. He mentioned many times that the root of sin in the Roman Catholic priesthood was the love of material things. Pointing to the priests' fine clothing and lives of ease, he claimed that these things were their goal in life instead of service. He criticized the Lutheran clergy in the same way, claiming that many of them were as avaricious and usurious as the members of their congregations. The office of preacher or shepherd, he said, had been made a profession or trade, rather than a means of service. Where the salary was highest there were many preachers, and where there was little salary there were no preachers.

Rideman, too, criticized the Catholic priesthood in its desire for material things. The communion service, he said, was used by them primarily as a money-making concern. This greed of priests, he believed, was proof that they were not doing the will of the Lord. "For this reason we receive not priests into our house; that is, we have naught to do with them, buy naught from them and likewise sell naught to them, neither food nor drink when they demand it. Neither in work nor in any business connection have we aught to do with them."[34] It is evident that the Hutterites did not consider the desire for material things as a Christian attribute, especially for a minister of the Gospel.

The proper Christian attitude toward material goods meant to the sixteenth-century Anabaptists, then, that a person was to keep himself free from materialism. Earthly possessions were viewed as gifts from God, to be used to His glory, and to serve fellow men. Christians were to trust in God for temporal necessities. If possible, believers were to earn their living, in the case of the Dutch Anabaptists, and only were to receive assistance from brethren if necessities of life could not be earned. The Hutterites interpreted this trust in God for material things as community of goods. Both the Dutch Brethren and the Hutterites believed that the cause of much of the sin in the world was the love of the material, and that the true Christian must keep himself free from any greed, or desire for things of this world.

We have looked at the economic teachings of Menno Simons and Peter Rideman as divided into three main sections:

(1) Economic teachings related to brotherhood

(2) Principles guiding the business life of the brethren

[34] Rideman, *op cit.*, 96.

(3) The proper attitude of Christians toward material things. In order to summarize the main principles of these teachings, and to see in outline form the similarities and differences between the economic teachings of these two men, the following chart has been constructed.

RIDEMAN	MENNO
Economic Teaching Related to Brotherhood	
True fellowship involves economic equality.	True fellowship involves economic equality.
This leads to the formation of community of goods in which:	This leades to the formation of community of kind in which:
—there is compulsory sharing through having property in common;	—sacrificial sharing is motivated by Christian love;
—rich and poor classes are done away with by equal distribution of goods;	—the extremes of rich and poor are opposed because they break the fellowship;
—there is co-operative production.	—there is individual production of goods and earning of living.
Principles Guiding the Business Life of the Brethren	
Christians should foster an economic system based on agriculture rather than commerce	Christians should foster an economic system based on agriculture rather than commerce
—finance and capital are opposed;	—finance and capital are opposed;
—usury is condemned;	—usury is condemned;
—members are forbidden the occupation of trader or merchant;	—occupation of trader or merchant is considered as extremely dangerous;
—farming and the crafts are considered most suited to Christians.	—farming and the crafts are considered most suited to Christians.
Christians must not participate in any industry which produces articles used in unchristian practices.	Christians must not participate in any industry which produces articles used in unchristian practices.

Christians should willingly pay taxes used to support the government, but must not pay taxes levied to support a war effort or other unchristian practices.	Christians are to pay all taxes imposed by the government, regardless of type.
No employer-employee relations.	Regarding labor relations, both employer and employee are to treat each other in a Christian and charitable way.

Proper Christian Attitude Toward Material Things

Materialistic attitude is not Christian.	Materialistic attitude is not Christian.
Earthly goods are neither good nor bad in themselves, but are to the Christian a means of doing good.	Earthly goods are neither good nor bad in themselves, but are to the Christian a means of doing good.
Trust in God for necessities of life is part of the Christian privilege	Trust in God for necessities of life is part of the Christian privilege
—this trust is fulfilled when an individual joins the Community of goods;	—each Christian should work to earn a living for himself;
—God provides through the brotherhood all necessities of life.	—the brethren will supply in Christian love those necessities which cannot be earned;
	—ministers, too, should earn much of their own living, if possible, and should accept love offerings rather than wages.
The unfortunate state of the world is due in a large way to the fact that many professing Christians do not have a Christian attitude toward material possessions.	The unfortunate state of the world is due largely to the fact that many Christians have an unchristian attitude toward material possessions.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

An Iowa Mennonite Church Constitution of 1865

In 1800 Mennonite families from the Palatinate, including Rupps, Desters, and Schmitts, settled upon timber lands near Neuburg on the Danube upon the invitation of the Elector of Bavaria. There they established a church, maintained a parochial school, and developed a struggling community which they named Maxweiler.

During the fifty years these families lived on the Danube, their numbers grew more rapidly than their resources. Finding that it was impossible to buy land for their sons and that as Mennonites they had to be landowners in order to receive permission to marry, they decided to migrate to America. They also wished to escape the compulsory military service of Europe. Between 1852 and 1855 most of these families moved to Lee County, Iowa, to which settlement other Mennonite families from Weierhof, Germany, were also migrating.

In the decade and a half after 1861 some of the Lee County Mennonite families living near Franklin moved to the northwestern part of Washington County, Iowa, where cheap land was available. Among these families were the Steiners, Rupps, Desters, Galles, Webers, Krehbiels, and Schmitts. There they organized a Mennonite church, very likely in 1865, since the oldest book of the church secretary went back to that year. It was not until the business meeting of September 15, 1872, that they dropped the name Mennonite Church at Dayton, the near-by post office, and adopted the name of Evangelical Mennonite Salem Church. Earlier that year they had built their first church, on land obtained from one of their members, Jacob Schmitt. In 1871 they had built their parochial school and had employed as minister-teacher William Galle, a graduate of the Wadsworth, Ohio, pioneer Mennonite school.

The first church constitution of the Salem Church was very likely adopted in 1865. In 1873 the records of the first secretary book were transferred to a new one. Below the constitution were the names of twelve men, very likely all heads of families, who had signed the original constitution. Following the twelve names appeared this statement: "(To here carried over from the 1865 book)." Below this notation appeared the names of seven additional signers. This was followed by a family register, giving detailed information on each family in the congregation. The church was a member of the General Conference of the Mennonite Church of North America and was last represented in the conference of 1878. After 1875, the members began to move to Kansas, until finally only the Steiner family was left. The constitution is given below in a free translation by the author.

Church Regulations of the German Evangelical Mennonite Salem Church at Dayton, Washington County, Iowa

1.

Since God in His holy Book calls upon man to cultivate himself with his fellow men in a communion, and since the simple preaching of the Gospel saves, so we, the undersigned, have united in a Christian church which has the name: *Die Deutsche Evangelische Mennonitische Salems-Gemeinde, bei Dayton Washington Co. Iowa.*

Article 1. We call ourselves a German Evangelical Mennonite Church, because the services shall be rendered in the German language, as long as at least three voting members of the church demand it.

Article 2. We call ourselves Mennonites because we want to designate by that that we follow Menno in some special doctrines, namely baptism and the oath; and since we in this as well as in all the main teachings of salvation are founded with Menno alone on the Gospel as we have received it from the Lord Jesus Christ and the apostles, so we feel united in one faith and one communion with all truly evangelical ones, and prefer best to call ourselves *Evangelical Mennonites.*

2.

Article 1. A member entitled to vote is everyone who signs this church regulation and not only acknowledges himself by that to belong to the Evangelical Mennonite Church, but also promises to promote the well-being of the congregation by word and action.

Article 2. He who wishes to be taken in as a member with the right to vote and to remain in the congregation, shall report to a leader, the board deciding his acceptance by a majority vote.

Article 3. Of a new member it is required:

1. That he is a baptized Christian and considers himself obligated to strengthen himself in the growth and constancy of Christian life and action by active participation in the worship services of the congregation and by a faithful use of the holy sacraments and by conscientious living.
2. That he does not act contrary to the Evangelical Mennonite Church according to Section I and therefore also to the regulations of the same on such points as baptism of adults and church weddings.
3. That he does not lead an offensive life and does not live in obvious vices and bad habits.
4. That in all congregational meetings he devotes himself to Christian love and honesty and in no manner disturbs the regulations, the earnestness and the peace of the meetings.
5. That he submits willingly to the regulations of the congregation, which are set up by the church or may be set up, and where he has erred shall let himself be corrected in Christian love.
6. That he contributes by taxes to meet the church expenditures in case he is not exempted expressly by the board on account of his poverty.

Article 4. When someone has been accepted in the church under these conditions then he shall sign the church regulations in the presence of the board members. At the next public divine service the name of the new member shall be made known and the Lord's blessings shall be asked for him and for his connection with the congregation.

Article 5. Everyone who is outside a Mennonite communion and yet wishes to be taken into our Mennonite Church, to him shall be granted the entrance into this congregation as a member as soon as he fulfills Section 1 and the conditions given by the members.

Article 6. Those who have been accepted in the congregation through holy baptism are qualified for the election of the minister and board-members but for all remaining business elections only those who have entered into the 21st year.

Article 7. Every member qualified to vote has a claim to the goods or property of the congregation. This property of the church is indivisible and not dissolvable. He who withdraws from the church, with or without his free will, loses thereby also all claims to the church property.

3.

Article 1. If a member sins against the purity of the Christian teachings or Christian life, then the same shall be reminded according to Matt. 18:15. If this is without success, then a course shall be taken according to Matt. 18:16-18 and II Thess. 3:6, 14, 15.

Article 2. As causes for exclusion are to be considered all obvious acts of the flesh, as well as desecration of the Sabbath, disdain of the public divine services and of the holy sacraments, and neglect of children with respect to Christian instruction and education.

Article 3. The excluded person shall be accepted again as a member upon his petition if he comes once more to admit his sins and comes to an honest repentance and proves to God such by a public acknowledgment and by desisting from his sins.

4.

Article 1. The preachers are to be chosen by the congregation according to the example of the apostles. However, if it should be the case that the church had the opportunity to place a capable man in this position the congregation shall have the right to do this.

Article 2. The preacher or the preachers has or have to hold closely to the basic teachings of the Mennonites as they have been given us by the Lord Jesus Christ, so that all false teaching be banished from the church.

Article 3. The Church Board consists of at least three chosen members and the preachers.

Article 4. Each board member has to keep his office for 5 years, and at the end of this time a new election shall take place, in which each of the old board members can be re-elected.

Article 5. The board members of the church shall keep order and peace before, during, and after each church service and other church meetings; and order everything that might hinder the cause or would be unfit.

Article 6. The board members in the name of the congregation shall administer the church property, shall make contracts with respect to the same, pay out money, raise money, sign documents, in general administer all activities which the congregation would otherwise have to do itself. Yet the board has to observe the rule that in extraordinary and important business matters it must first have received a church decision. Once a year it must give account and reports; this may be done at the end or at the beginning of each year.

5

Article 1. Everyone is obligated to send his child at the age of 14 to the baptism instructions. It shall be the duty of the minister, however, in case he finds a child not ready for baptism (to his best knowledge and conscience), to turn back the same for the time being. Also children of a younger age may be admitted to the instruction for baptism.

Article 2. The instruction for the children for baptism shall last from 5 to 6 months, and each time between Easter and Michaelmas.

Article 3. The ceremony of the Lord's Supper shall be held 4 times annually and before the same a preparatory service shall take place each time. The ceremony of the Lord's Supper shall be announced to the community one or two weeks in advance, and with this announcement shall be given a Christian admonition to the participants, so that they prepare themselves zealously in true repentance for the holy ceremony.

Article 4. Each person who does not belong to the congregation should report either to the preacher or to a board member of the church, who has then the duty to present to such an applicant the importance of the Lord's Supper with the obligations and regulations, and where it is possible, to demand a testimony from him.

Article 5. The partaking of the holy bread shall take place in common; i.e., the participants shall take the blessed bread in faith at the same time.

6.

Article 1. Two publications shall precede each marriage, and each marriage shall be performed by a preacher of the congregation; to each bridal couple it shall be left free to choose at what place the wedding shall take place. However, it is desired that the ceremony take place in the church.

Article 2. Each member of our church who marries in another part of the country and then settles in this community, is obligated to bring a marriage certificate from the preacher who married him, in case he wants to remain a member of the congregation.

Article 3. Each woman in childbed shall announce the same to the preacher before her first time out of church in order that the preacher pray an especially appropriate prayer and give the child the blessing and protection and care of the Lord.

7.

Article 1. Each church meeting shall be announced on the preceding Sunday. Each church meeting is to be opened and closed with a prayer.

Article 2. In this church a record of the source of its development, growth and expansion shall be kept.

Article 3. The church regulations shall be read twice annually at the close of the church year and at the close of the calendar year by a preacher or a board member before the gathered congregation.

Article 4. The congregation reserves all rights to expand the regulations of the congregation in the future according to circumstances. Yet there shall never be made any additions which contradict the Word of the Lord or through which would be changed the paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.

8.

According to the Word of God it is demanded of each member of our congregation, as well as of him who may just enter our congregation, that he has no connections with any secret society; for the powers of the darkness are not compatible with those of the light.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with us all now and forever. Amen!

—Melvin Gingerich

Coals of Fire. By Elizabeth Hershberger Bauman. Scottdale: Herald Press, 1954. Pp. 128, illustrated. $1.95.

There is a no more effective way to burn the pages of Biblical truth into the minds of youth than by providing them with great stories of men and women who have lived these truths in their lives. This is the real contribution of *Coals of Fire,* a recently published book of short stories for younger teen-age youth by Elizabeth Hershberger Bauman.

Just as the parables made vivid the teachings of Christ, so these seventeen stories fan to a flaming reality the Biblical injunction of Romans 12:20, 21, "Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good." It is with this Scripture as a theme that Mrs. Bauman wrote this excellent and important book.

At first glance the reader might question a certain disunity of subject matter, for the stories jump in time and place from the early Christian era, to colonial America, to present-day relief work under the Mennonite Central Committee. The characters are as diverse as Amishman Jacob in Pennsylvania, Isaac of Biblical times, and Ernest Swalm, the courageous Canadian conscientious objector in World War I—to mention only three. But the stories are based on historical fact, and it is this diversity of place and time and people that crystallizes an all-encompassing unity—that the way of the Christian love can bind all people together now and forever.

It would be difficult for young readers and older readers as well to find instances of more excitement, courage, and heroism than these stories contain. There is, for example, the fear that gripped the little Amish family as savage Indians approached their isolated cabin to plunder and kill, the tense moment in the life of Preacher John Franz in Montana as drunken patriots led him to a tree with an open noose hanging from its branches, or the tragic moment when Marie Fast, MCC worker, sank beneath the waves of a ship struck by a mine.

Occasionally, at the expense of historical accuracy, this reviewer felt an urge to fictionalize stories in the book, dramatizing a climax here and there and tying loose ends into more satisfying conclusions, especially in the story of Amishman Jacob, who would not retaliate with force and saw most of his family massacred. How was this tremendous sacrifice appreciated by the community? Was Jacob found after his capture by the Indians? Such insertions, however, would be minor, for the stories stand ably, stripped down to the true facts.

This book should meet the need for nonresistance teaching that can be understood by younger teen-agers. It should also assist the parents and teachers of this age group, Sunday-school teachers, Sunday-school librarians, pastors interested in promoting nonresistance, and Christian day schools. There has been too much flat prose dealing with church problems. A book such as this should be an inspiring forerunner for something similar in missionary, relief, and other fields. At least half of the stories are from Mennonite or Anabaptist sources.

The stories are attractively illustrated by Allan Eitzen, and the Herald Press of Scottdale deserves special praise for producing a youth book on a par with standard American publishing practices. It has demonstrated with this book its ability to enter a new literary medium, books for children and youth.

Lombard, Illinois BARBARA C. SMUCKER.

Pilgrims in Paraguay. The Story of Mennonite Colonization in South America. By Joseph Winfield Fretz. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1953. Pp. 247, illustrated, index. $2.75.

Since World War I Latin America has become a new home of many Mennonites. Next to Mexico which has approximately 18,000 Mennonites, Paraguay has the largest number with about 12,000. These figures refer to Mennonite population and not baptized members. The present work, as the main title, *Pilgrims in Paraguay,* suggests, deals largely with the Mennonites in Paraguay. The subtitle, however, is broader: *The Story of Mennonite Colonization in South America.* This enables the author to deal briefly with the Mennonites in Brazil, Uruguay, Argentina, and Colombia.

The author, J. Winfield Fretz, is professor of sociology and economics at Bethel College, North Newton, Kansas. As such, and as a student of other Mennonite colonization projects, he was well qualified to make this study which he calls a sociological report of Mennonite colonization effort in South America. This "is an attempt to present systematically the story of Mennonite migrations and settlements; their backgrounds, problems, and prospects. Special effort has been made to describe as vividly and accurately as possible the conditions as they are today." Not a history as such, the work provides, the author hopes, enough historical detail to furnish background for an intelligent understanding of present developments. "The chief purpose of this book is to give the reader a clear picture of the results of twenty-five years of Mennonite colonization effort in South America." An on-the-field study of several months in 1951 was made possible by a financial grant from the Social Science Research Council. The study was also carried out as an assignment by the Mennonite Central Committee.

In this reviewer's opinion the author has succeeded well in his purpose. Other accounts of the Mennonites in Paraguay have been written, including helpful eyewitness reports. But the present work is the most up-to-date and complete account of the sociological, religious, cultural, governmental, and economic conditions of the Mennonite colonists in South America, particularly in Paraguay. The story of the establishment of the new Mennonite colonies following World War II in itself makes the work worth while.

After a very brief introductory chapter on Paraguay, and two chapters on the founding of the various Mennonite colonies in the country, including a brief treatment of the Hutterites, there are chapters on home and family, education and the church, government and social welfare, manners and customs, health and medical facilities, agriculture, and economics and industry. One chapter is given to the Mennonites in Brazil, and another chapter deals very briefly with the Mennonites in Uruguay, Argentina, and Colombia. An additional chapter deals with the Mennonite Central Committee in South America, and the final chapter is on the future of the Mennonites in South America. One feature which greatly enhances the value of the work is the inclusion of 40 valuable statistical tables on population, immigration, emigration, church membership, various kinds of agricultural data, and other items, for the various colonies. The more than 50 photographic illustrations also add interest as well as information. There are also a few appendices, a bibliography, and an index. The few footnotes citing authorities are at the end of the chapters.

As a report on contemporary conditions among the Mennonites in Paraguay the work is quite complete and generally tells anyone interested in the subject what he wants to know. The author writes in a sympathetic and yet scholarly fashion. Obviously impressed by the courageous struggle of these South American pioneers, as other observers have

been, he does not hesitate to point out the weaknesses of his fellow Mennonites as well as their strong points. Some may be surprised at the large number of adults who are not church members—in Fernheim 18 per cent of the population over 17 years of age, in Friesland 28 per cent, and in Neuland and Volendam about 40 and 60 per cent, respectively, of the people 16 years of age and over. No doubt the years of antireligious teaching by the Russian communists had something to do with this.

In regard to the often-raised question about the future prospects of the Mennonites in Paraguay the author makes this interesting statement: "In the light of all the evidence at hand, past and present, visible and invisible, this writer is compelled to take an optimistic view about the future of the Mennonite colonies in Paraguay."

By way of adverse criticism this reviewer has little to offer. To say that style and clarity could have been improved at a few places is merely to state what is true of most writing. The work seems to be remarkably free of typographical errors and inaccuracies. A few were noted but most of these were of little consequence. The map following page 32, showing Mennonite settlements in Brazil, Uruguay, and Paraguay, shows the Bolivian-Paraguayan boundary as it was before and not after the Chaco War. United States government aid was given to Paraguay before 1950 (p. 7). *Mandioca* is used in the book as though it were an English word. *Mandioca* is Spanish. In English it is manioc. Table 31 (p. 84) is not likely to be understood with regard to the item on Argentina. The total church membership in Argentina is there listed as 669 but the total Mennonite population is listed as 500. Here and on pages 196, 197, and 208 the term Mennonite is used carelessly, as, for example, in the statement: "The total number of 'Mennonites' in Argentina is estimated at about 500." The author apparently means the total number of those not connected with the (old) Mennonite church in Argentina. Though Mr. and Mrs. Willard H. Smith secured more adequate quarters for the MCC center in Asuncion in 1944, and enlarged the work, they did not establish the first MCC home there (p. 207). The home was started in 1943 by A. E. Janzen and Robert Geigley.

Mennonites and others interested in the subject, including a good many in the world of scholarship, will be grateful to Dr. Fretz for producing this authoritative and informational volume.

Goshen College Willard H. Smith

Christianity, Diplomacy and War. By Herbert Butterfield. Nashville: Abingdon Cokesbury, n.d. (1953?). Pp. 125. $1.75.

At crucial moments in history when old and cherished structures of thought and society are seen to crumble, God has focused His work on a point, or a man, where human reason and discipleship cross paths, where lucid intelligences coincide with commitments ready to burn their bridges behind them. To say nothing of the places of Abraham, Moses, and the New Testament writers in the divine economy, one may legitimately find cases in point in the clergy and young humanists who gave Anabaptism its specific form in Zürich as well as in the story of the rise of Methodism.

It is not too much to maintain that another coincidence of rationality and discipleship is beginning to take form in the way in which modern academic research tends to discover and confirm the New Testament-Anabaptist position. After a long period of destructive negation in reaction to orthodoxy, we now see the growth of a "post-critical" Biblical theology which sees discipleship as the purpose of God's revelation.

After the breakdown of optimistic liberalism, dogmatics is returning to an appreciation of the importance of the eschatological dimension in Christian faith. Church historians, after centuries spent in the defense of the state-church system, now begin to see in the Anabaptist position insights which the Reformers would have done better to accept. Still another case of this phenomenon is Herbert Butterfield's *Christianity, Diplomacy and War.* Professor Butterfield writing as a student of history without any dogmatic presuppositions except the desire for scientific objectivity, has written a statement on the New Testament-Anabaptist doctrine of the state.

The New Testament affirmation is that the powers that be are under the dominion of Christ the Lord, and that in this submission the state is a minister of God for the preservation of order during the age of the church. If, however, the state seeks to escape from Christ's dominion by claiming a higher mission than the maintenance of order, and attempts to enforce absolute allegiance or to impose upon men its religion or system of values, that state is condemned by the New Testament as demonic and doomed.

The Anabaptist affirmation is identical: "The sword is an ordinance of God outside the perfection of Christ for the protection of the good and the punishment of evil." Nor did the Anabaptists hesitate to label as demonic the state (or state church) which overstepped this authority and sought to enforce right belief or unquestioning civil loyalty. Their refusal to accept the Constantinian identification of church and world was condemned by Catholics and Protestants alike for both knew that this refusal, more than any of its particular doctrinal or ecclesiological views, threatened the very foundations of the medieval "Christian" social order. The Crusades and the religious wars from Zwingli's time to 1648 were examples of this church-world union which, when threatened, is willing rather to destroy the social order in the interest of the cause of God (represented by the divine calling of a particular state).

Butterfield's study, founded on a knowledge of historical fact both broad and detailed, demonstrates pragmatically the New Testament view. History teaches us that when wars have attempted to serve causes whose sanctity could then authorize any degree of destructiveness and demand the enemy's unconditional surrender their result has been more harmful than beneficial, disrupting the total fabric of society, falsifying the real meaning of the power conflict incarnated by war, and creating more tensions than they resolved. On the other hand, limited wars, aimed at a local adjustment of a particular imperfection in the balance of power, have been useful as safety valves and may be meaningfully compared with the function exercised by the police within a state. The more limited a war is kept the better this parallel with the legitimate police function becomes. The best possible example is the sublimation of actual war into the balance-of-power diplomacy of the Victorian era or of the United Nations.

This sort of realism, which sees the political task as that of maintaining a tolerable balance of egoisms rather than the attainment of ideal justice, is the counterpart of the New Testament's recognition that the use of force has its place in fallen society and that under the reign of Christ it may serve the interests of order and provisional justice. That kind of justice, however, remains "outside the perfection of Christ," that is, it may not claim moral sanction to use force in any way but as restraint.

Only Christian disinterestedness and objectivity can effectively base on this criterion critical judgments concerning precise political problems. It is not in place for a peace church to propose to the world a peace program which will work without repentance. It is possible, however, and a duty, for the church to express prophetic judgments on current politics on the basis of what is clearly the state's task. There can be no objection to the use of force by a state within a police framework (though there can be and should be an evangelistic appeal addressed to the policeman as a man). But when a state goes beyond this limit, either within or without its borders, and uses force for a "cause," aiming at the enemy's total subjugation, accepting the allies and the weapons which seem useful or necessary, the prophetic voice of the church should say that such a police operation or such a war is wrong, not only for the Christians (on the basis of discipleship and nonresistance) but also for the state (on the basis of I Peter 2:14 and I Timothy 2:2).

The Thirty Years' War is a case in point. Both Catholics and Protestants considered peaceful coexistence as an absolute impossibility. Each side was ready to consider its cause as a crusade for the honor of God and ready therefore to use any methods, even the annihilation of civilization, to assure the enemy's utter defeat. The result was destruction such as had never been seen before and the final fixation of Europe's pattern of nationalism.

The parallels with the ideological wars of the twentieth century are obvious. It is no accident that *Life* devoted an editorial to an attack on Butterfield's book, since it is the Luce-Dulles mentality which is most concerned to prepare America for a new crusade, with the same axioms as in the early seventeenth century: an unredeemable enemy; a holy calling to defend the cause of God; the impossibility of peaceful coexistence; the legitimacy of any alliances and any weapons which may aid in the enemy's destruction, whether they are in conformity with the holy cause or not. Be it in America, or in Russia, where an identical mentality reigns, the church must denounce this crusading mentality as a demonic denial of the Biblically defined function of the state and flagrantly outside the legitimate place of the use of force in the fallen social order.

Butterfield has applied to war the New Testament doctrine of the state. This is not to say that his analysis of war deals satisfactorily with its relation to the Biblical standards of personal ethics, the way of the cross, and the separation of church and world. This is not a weakness of the book, since it was not the author's intention to deal with the economy of redemption and the question of the Christian's participation in war. As to the place of the sword as "an ordinance of God outside the perfection of Christ," this book has enormous importance; this is the realm where the data of history confirm the truth of revelation. For a Christian judgment on life "within the perfection of Christ," which is less the task of the historian, we shall look elsewhere.

Valdoie (Ter. de Belfort), France JOHN HOWARD YODER